United Nations

A/C.1/52/PV.21

General Assembly

Fifty-second session

Official Records

First Committee

21st Meeting

Wednesday, 12 November 1997, 3 p.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Nkgowe . . . . . (Botswana)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Agenda items 62 to 83 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: As I informed members of the Committee at our meeting this morning, the Committee will proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions A/C.1/52/L.39/Rev.1, L.8/Rev.1 and those draft resolutions which appear in clusters 7, 8, 9 and 10, except A/C.1/52/L.3, L.11/Rev.1, L.36 and L.42.

Before the Committee proceeds to take decisions on draft resolution L.39/Rev.1, I will call upon those representatives wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): As the Committee will have noticed, A/C.1/52/L.39/Rev.1 has been circulated. It contains just two small changes. In the seventh preambular paragraph, after "Taking note of the recent proposals for disarmament", the words "and nuclear non-proliferation" have been deleted. In the penultimate line of the ninth preambular paragraph, in the phrase which read "would enhance the security of smaller States", the word "smaller" has been changed to "all".

These are the only two changes that have been made in this draft resolution, and given these changes it is the expectation of the sponsors that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote. I sincerely hope that this will be the case.

The Chairman: If no other representatives wish to take the floor at this stage, I will give the floor those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.39/Rev.1.

As I see none, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution L.39/Rev.1.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997. The draft resolution was sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.39/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I will now give the floor to those representatives wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

If no one wishes to take the floor, the Committee will proceed to consider draft resolution L.8/Rev.1.

I now give the floor to those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution L.8/Rev.1.

97-86497 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Mr. Mallam Daouda (Niger) (*interpretation from French*): The draft resolution in document A/C.1/52/L.8/Rev.1, on assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them, is the simplest of the draft resolutions submitted to the First Committee. Indeed, it has no political implications. If in certain parts of the world small arms are used for hunting, this is not true in Africa, and particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, where, as we have already said, they are used to kill women, children and men of all ages. Given my comments, I request the Committee to vote overwhelmingly in favour of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: Are there other delegations wishing to take the floor at this stage? I see none.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.8/Rev.1.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.8/Rev.1, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them", was introduced by the representative of Mali at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, the draft resolution is also sponsored by Haiti.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now turn to the draft resolutions in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". I call upon delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanations of their position or vote on the draft resolutions contained in that cluster.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico)(*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to say a few words on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.16. When we were working on this draft resolution, the 1996 *United Nations Disarmament Yearbook* had not been distributed. Since then, fortunately, the Secretariat has been kind enough to distribute that important volume. In view of this, and because some delegations have since contacted us to observe that the language in the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution is a bit too strong, reading:

> "*Noting with concern* the delay in the publication of the 1996 *United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*",

we propose to delete the term "with concern". The last preambular paragraph of draft resolution L.16 would then read:

> "*Noting* the delay in the publication of the 1996 *United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*".

With this change, we hope that draft resolution L.16 can be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Millim (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): It is my honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia and the associated country, Cyprus — align themselves with this statement. The countries associated with the European economic area, Iceland and Norway, also align themselves with this statement.

Following a decision of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General's reform programme has been considered in plenary meeting under the leadership of the President of the Assembly, who specifically requested the Committee to ensure that its activities did not duplicate the work of the Assembly.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42, the European Union has adopted the position of principle that the submission of that draft resolution in the First Committee, independent from the discussion of its substantive merits, risks seriously disturbing the integrated and smooth conduct of the consideration of the proposals of the Secretary-General.

In that light, the European Union would urgently appeal to the sponsors of the draft resolution to withdraw it. If draft resolution L.42 were to be put to a vote, the European Union would vote as a bloc against it.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I would like to make a few general remarks on this cluster of draft resolutions and focus in particular on the draft we consider to be the most important in this cluster, namely, draft resolution

A/C.1/52/L.42, dealing with the question of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

I would like to emphasize, as we have done earlier, that draft resolution L.42 is not designed in any way to intervene in or interfere with the process of the reform that is being conducted by the Secretary-General and that is being considered in the plenary of the General Assembly. We believe, however, that in this phase of the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, which is almost 8 years after the end of the cold war, it is necessary for the General Assembly to reaffirm the broad parameters of the efforts that are being made in the main machinery that has been established, which is the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, of course, with the help of the Secretariat.

Such a reaffirmation, we believe, would reinforce and strengthen the process of reform being conducted by the Secretary-General and would give a sense of direction to the work that is conducted in the inter-governmental organizations, including this Committee, the Disarmament Commission and, especially, the Conference on Disarmament.

The sponsors of A/C.1/52/L.42, having been advised privately of the concerns that have just been expressed by the representative of the European Union, have considered the text and have decided to assuage such concerns by deleting the first preambular paragraph of L.42, which is the only reference in this draft resolution to the restructuring of the United Nations Secretariat and the report of the Secretary-General [A/51/950]. With this deletion, the draft resolution will stand on its own and is totally independent of the reform process that is being conducted in plenary.

If this draft resolution is read without the first preambular paragraph, the Committee will note that its provisions reflect only the agreed positions and decisions of the General Assembly, and thus it is our expectation that these provisions will create no difficulty, procedural or substantive, for any delegation in the General Assembly. It is our hope that with this revision, all delegations in the Committee will find it possible both to consider this draft resolution and to vote in its favour.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to place on record the importance that it attaches to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/52/L.42. Of course, at no time did we seek to influence in any way the analysis or consideration of the Secretary-General's programme for reform.

We believe this draft resolution has something important to say with regard to the role of the United Nations in disarmament and to the implementation of recommendations and decisions adopted by consensus by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. I feel that this draft resolution is not only valuable in itself; it is also a reaffirmation of what the Assembly itself has already decided, and decided by consensus, and it should remain valid until other consensus resolutions are approved.

We are not unaware of the fact that there have been discussions about the durability of the validity of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly [resolution S-10/2] as regards the disarmament priorities contained therein. But what was agreed by consensus is still valid until that consensus is replaced by something else. We believe that this draft resolution is of paramount importance in a year in which international public opinion may, at the very least, be somewhat surprised or perplexed by the scant progress made multilaterally in the disarmament field in the United Nations.

Of course, my delegation fully agrees with deleting the first preambular paragraph and would not understand, or would understand far too well, how someone could not support the draft resolution once that preambular paragraph has been deleted.

The Chairman: Are there other delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanations of their position or vote on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 7?

I will now give the floor to those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.16. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.16.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.16, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 17th meeting, on 7 November 1997. The draft resolution is sponsored by those

countries listed in the draft resolution itself and document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

At this afternoon's meeting the representative of Mexico made an oral revision in the last preambular paragraph, namely, after "Noting", delete the words "with concern".

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed their wish that the draft resolution, as orally revised, be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.16, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20.

I give the floor to those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, it is also sponsored by Ecuador.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20?

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20 was adopted.

The Chairman: I will now give the floor to those delegations who wish to explain their position or vote after the decision. I see none.

The Committee will proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.21.

I first give the floor to those members of the Committee who wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution. I see none.

The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.21.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.21, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", was introduced by the representative of Colombia at the 15th meeting, on 5 November 1997. The draft resolution is sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.21?

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.21 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now give the floor to those delegations who wish to explain their position or vote after the decision. I see none.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanation of their position or vote on draft resolutions contained in cluster 8. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.9.

I shall first give the floor to those members of the Committee who wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.9. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.9, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 16th

meeting, on 6 November 1997. The draft resolution is sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.9?

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.9 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote after the decision.

Mr. Grey (United States): I request that the record of today's proceedings reflect that the United States did not participate in the consensus on resolution A/C.1/52/L.9, which asserts a relationship between disarmament and development. We believe that disarmament and development are two distinct issues which simply do not lend themselves to being linked. It was for this reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 conference on this matter.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to state again that the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the declarations in the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

Mr. Millim (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union, namely, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and the associated country of Cyprus all align themselves with this explanation of vote, as does Iceland, a member country of the European economic area.

The member States of the European Union have again reached consensus on the draft contained in A/C.1/52/L.9, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", and we would like to make a few clarifications.

Though we acknowledge the considerable advantages that may flow from disarmament, the European Union considers that there is no direct and automatic linkage between, on the one hand, commitments entered into by the European Union regarding economic and social development and development assistance and, on the other, savings realized elsewhere, including in the area of disarmament.

We would also like to emphasize the commitment of the European Union in this regard and point out that the assistance provided by the European Union and its member States to the developing countries represents approximately 40 per cent of all international assistance for development.

Mr. Danieli (Israel): Israel has joined the consensus on this resolution. At the same time, Israel dissociates itself from the provisions and contents of the Final Document of the Eleventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cartagena de Indias, Colombia, in October 1995, and does not see itself as part of the recommendations contained therein.

The Chairman: If there are no other delegations wishing to take the floor at this stage, the Committee will proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/L.10/Rev.1.

I now give the floor to those members of the Committee who wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.10/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997. The draft resolution was sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself and document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica,

Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, Israel, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Monaco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted by 138 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Liberia and Jordan informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to explain their votes.

Mr. Sun (Republic of Korea): My delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control". My delegation is of the view this year's draft resolution duly reflects the ongoing international efforts to incorporate environmental norms into disarmament and arms control agreements. We believe that the observance of environmental norms in the field of disarmament will contribute to global efforts to preserve the environment and to make the earth a safer and cleaner place to live.

Last my delegation abstained in the voting on the relevant draft resolution because it dealt only with certain disarmament agreements and contained certain unnecessary provisions which might lead to a wrong interpretation of the entire draft resolution and impair its well-motivated objectives and principles.

This year, however, my delegation has concluded that significant improvements have been made in the present draft resolution and that the problems which prevented my delegation from supporting last year's draft have been rectified. It is for this reason that my delegation has changed the position of abstention that it took last year and voted in favour of the draft resolution this year.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.12. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.12, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 16th meeting on 6 November 1997. The draft resolution was sponsored by Colombia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan,

Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey

The draft resolution was adopted by 104 votes to 3, with 38 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Dominican Republic and Jordan informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Albania had intended to abstain.]

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): As has been the case for many years, the United States again this year was compelled to vote against the draft resolution on "Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

This draft resolution, like its predecessors, does not meet the requirements necessary to warrant our support. It fails to recognize the navigational rights and freedoms protected under customary international law, as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. In our view, freedom of overflight, rights of innocent passage through territorial seas, transit passage through international straits and archipelagic sea-lanes passage must be explicitly acknowledged in this resolution in addition to acknowledging freedom of navigation on the high seas. Absent such acknowledgments, the United States cannot and will not support any resolutions along the lines of this draft.

Furthermore, we remain concerned by the financial burden placed on the United Nations by the continued existence of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. In a budgetary environment marked by retrenchment across the board, the United Nations cannot afford to support bodies that no longer serve any useful purpose.

No one denies that the issues of security and the peaceful resolution of disputes in the Indian Ocean region are important. The question is how best to address them effectively in a financially responsible manner. As the United States noted last year, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean is the only such group that meets under the auspices and budget of the United Nations. This should stop. The regional participants should identify an appropriate regional forum for their substantive discussions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.14. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.14, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of India at the 17th meeting, on 7 November 1997. The draft resolution was sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself and document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, South Africa, Turkmenistan, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.14 was adopted by 88 votes to 42, with 17 abstentions

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote after the decision.

Mr. Fu Zhigang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.14, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament".

China is concerned about the negative impact that military applications of science and technology may have on international peace and security. It supports the efforts by the international community to strengthen the international non-proliferation regime, and it endorses the implementation of stringent non-proliferation measures for weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear, biological and chemical weapons.

At the same time, the Chinese delegation firmly believes that the existing discriminatory and exclusive export control regimes and arrangements must be overhauled and revamped. An export control regime for dual-use technologies and equipment must be established through the broad participation of the international community.

No non-proliferation measure should hinder international cooperation on the peaceful uses of science and technology. All countries must follow the procedures set forth in the international legal instruments, including using dialogue and cooperation to remove any concerns regarding proliferation, so as to achieve the common objective of international non-proliferation.

As much as China is concerned about the application of advanced science and technology in the development of weapons of mass destruction, it is equally — indeed, more — concerned about its application in the development of outer-space weapons, such as anti-satellite weapons and the so-called theatre missile defence systems. Seen from this perspective, the application of military science and technology has the same significance for both conventional weapons and those of mass destruction. For this reason, we believe that the wording in the second preambular paragraph of this draft resolution could be improved.

The Chairman: If there are no further speakers in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.14, I will now call upon those delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanation of position or vote on draft resolutions contained in cluster 9. I see none.

I call on those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.18. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.18.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.18, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 16th

meeting, on 6 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, the draft resolution is sponsored by Iceland, Slovakia and Bulgaria.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.18 was adopted.

The Chairman: I call on those delegations wishing to explain their position after the decision. I see none.

I now call on those delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanation of their position or vote on draft resolutions contained in cluster 10. I see none.

I now call on those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/52/L.13. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/52/L.13.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/52/L.13, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 16th meeting of the Committee on 6 November 1997.

The draft decision was sponsored by Colombia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft decision A/C.1/52/L.13 was adopted by 96 votes to none, with 48 abstentions

The Chairman: As no representatives wish to explain their vote or position, we have finished taking action on those draft resolutions that were ready for this afternoon. We cannot, unfortunately, take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34, because the sponsor is not here this afternoon. However, if the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45 are ready, we can take action on it now.

Ms. Laker (Canada): On behalf of Poland, Canada would like to ask that the Committee take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45 this afternoon.

The Chairman: We will therefore take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45.

The Chairman: There being no members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45, the Committee will now take action on the draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45, entitled "Status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 17th meeting of the Committee on 7 November 1997.

The draft resolution was sponsored by those countries listed in the draft.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Abou-Hadid (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45, entitled "Status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction". Had the draft resolution been put to the vote, my delegation would have abstained because the final text of the Convention does not take account of the observations made by the Arab States. Our position is based on the following considerations.

The Convention lacks adequate procedures for ensuring that the verification system is not misused through challenges to it. The Convention does not state explicitly that its implementation will not be an obstacle or impediment to the economic and technological development of the parties, especially developing countries parties. Notably, in that regard, the Convention does not set out comprehensive safeguards to deter the use or threat of use of chemical weapons against any party to the Convention. We consider this to be a shortcoming in the Convention — as it is in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which has not achieved universality 25 years after its entry into force. One well known reason for this shortcoming relates to safeguards.

For States, national security is an indivisible integral whole. All types of threats to security should be addressed equally in terms of seriousness and of the proper balance of the constituent elements of national security.

Here, the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament set out the priorities of disarmament. The top priority is nuclear weapons, since, because of their uniquely vast destructive effects, these pose the most serious threat to the very future of mankind.

In the light of those considerations, the Arab States understood this many years ago and renounced the nuclear option. They have become convinced of the serious threat posed to the Middle East by the nuclear-arms race in the light of the acute tensions that assail the region and the failure thus far to find just and comprehensive solutions to the numerous problems there. These risks continue to imperil the security of the States of the region.

The Arab States, my country included, have thus taken the initiative to support efforts to make the Middle East into a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The majority of the States of the region have joined in this endeavour — in fact, all but one: Israel, which remains outside the framework of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and refuses to accede to that Treaty. Its refusal is based on all manner of pretexts. Sometimes it invokes the peace process, which began 20 years after the entry into force of the NPT.

It has become common when we vote on draft resolutions on nuclear-weapon-free zones to hear from the representative of the one State in the region that has yet to accede to the NPT. That State refuses to subject all its nuclear installations to the comprehensive safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

The Syrian Arab Republic and the other Arab States of the region have thus firmly supported the establishment of the Middle East as a region free of all weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, which are the most dangerous of all.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I wish to explain the reasons why, and the context within which, Pakistan has been able to support draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45, on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development,

Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction. Despite our concerns and reservations regarding certain provisions of the Chemical Weapons Convention, which we articulated at the time the Convention was adopted as well as subsequently, Pakistan signed the Convention to underscore its commitment to the objective of the complete elimination, regionally and globally, of this abhorrent means of warfare. In order to promote this basic objective in our region, we also entered into a solemn declaration on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons in South Asia.

The entry into force of the Convention revealed the unpleasant reality of the presence of chemical-weapons stockpiles and production facilities designed to be used against Pakistan. This situation created a qualitatively new situation for Pakistan and complicated our decision as regards the ratification of the Convention. Our concerns were highlighted in the statement made by my Minister of State for Foreign Affairs in the general debate in this Committee.

Despite these challenges, I take great satisfaction in announcing in this Committee that, following a bold decision taken by the Government of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, Pakistan submitted its instrument of ratification to the Chemical Weapons Convention on 28 October 1997. We will therefore attend the Second Conference of States Parties, to be held at The Hague early next month, as a State party. Pakistan's decision is a vote of confidence in the international community and in the collective contribution that it can and should make to advance the cause of peace and security on an equitable and non-discriminatory basis.

It also represents a practical manifestation of Pakistan's sincerity in pursuing the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. Pakistan has joined the Convention in the hope that it will be implemented in a fair and equitable manner and that it will serve to alleviate the genuine security concerns of all States, especially the non-possessors of chemical weapons.

Mr. Zahran (Egypt): Egypt has traditionally supported all measures designed to contribute to the promotion of international and regional stability and has always committed itself to engage in constructive actions in the fulfilment of this objective.

It is in this spirit that we cannot but sympathize with the general thrust of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.45, as the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (CWC) entered into the force on 29 April 1997. I should like to recall that we worked diligently among other delegations in order to elaborate a watertight Convention.

We firmly believe that a good and balanced Convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons would be a step forward, paving the way for the implementation of President Mubarak's initiative of April 1990, which called for declaring the Middle East a region free from all weapons of mass destruction, under effective international control. The said initiative is intended to involve all weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear, chemical and biological weapons.

The CWC, together with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (BWC), are considered to be three pillars on which the said zone should be established. Hence, from the regional perspective, we cannot dissociate the CWC from the NPT and the BWC. We are of the strong conviction that all States of the region should bear equal and reciprocal obligations deriving from the three aforementioned international instruments governing weapons of mass destruction all together. Sharing in good faith such common responsibility would contribute to confidence-building and thus greatly enhance peace and stability in the Middle East.

Israel remains the only State in the Middle East that has not yet adhered to the NPT. Furthermore, Israel is the only State in the region that operates nuclear facilities that are not under the full-scope safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Ridding the Middle East of all weapons of mass destruction by the adherence of all States of the region, without exception or double standards, to the NPT, CWC and BWC would constitute a positive contribution, as well as a confidence-building measure.

It is for these reasons that we do not consider ourselves part of the consensus that led to the adoption of this draft resolution. Furthermore, Egypt would have abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45 if it had been put to the vote.

Mr. Danieli (Israel): Israel has joined the consensus on this draft resolution. Furthermore, Israel recently joined the community of nations in welcoming the entry into force of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development,

Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (CWC).

Israel is proud to have been one of the original founding signatory States of the Convention. Our signature of the Convention and, subsequently, the active role that we took in the joint endeavour to craft it into workable mechanisms, reflect in general Israel's vision of the world in which it wishes to exist and prosper — in particular, its continuing interest, which is shared by many other countries, in preserving the Convention's core balance between a State's duty to demonstrate compliance and its right to protect itself from intrusive and abusive encroachment on its security and its commercial and proprietary interests.

By signing the Convention, Israel signalled its hope that others in its region would soon follow suit. Israel belongs to those Member States that have not yet ratified the Convention. This should come as no surprise to the world community, which is cognizant of the unique strategic and political environment in which Israel still operates today. At the signing ceremony in Paris in 1993, Israel's Foreign Minister openly stated Israel's position that

> "the Chemical Weapons Convention must refer to our region and ... the region at large must adhere to its principles".

In that context, Israel then made it clear that it would seek to ratify the Convention subject to its regional concerns as well as to its constitutional constraints and legislative timetable.

These considerations remain no less valid today. Israel is aware of — indeed, it welcomes — the fact that certain Arab States have signed or even ratified the Convention. However, it is, unfortunately, also a well-known reality that none of the chemical-weapons-capable or suspected chemical-weapons-armed Arab States have signed, let alone ratified, the Chemical Weapons Convention. Indeed, key non-signatory Arab States have indicated collectively that they would not change their position even if Israel were to ratify the Convention. Among them are countries which, in the past, have resorted to the use of chemical weapons and are believed to be developing capabilities in this field even as the world is pledging to forsake and eradicate forever all chemical weapons. From Israel's perspective, not only have chemical-weapons threats against it not receded in recent years; they have even gained in saliency and acuteness.

What I have stated must not be construed as prejudging the outcome of a future Israeli decision on the matter of ratification or of the continued Israeli support of the Convention. Favourable changes in the security climate will, of course, favourably affect Israel's attitude on the ratification issue.

Mr. Rao (India): I take the floor to explain our position.

India has consistently favoured the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction on the basis of multilaterally negotiated, comprehensive and non-discriminatory agreements. In keeping with our commitment, we take satisfaction in being an original State Party to and fulfilling our obligations deriving from the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (CWC). We urge all States to implement all provisions of the Chemical Weapons Convention with an equal degree of transparency and commitment.

We welcome the launching of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). We believe that issues relating to implementation are best discussed in forums of the OPCW, an organization set up exclusively to deal with the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention. We also believe that, now that the CWC has its own organizational set-up, it would be appropriate for the organization to consult on a draft resolution for the General Assembly in future years.

The Chairman: Are there other delegations wishing to speak to explain their position or vote after the decision was taken? There are none.

I understand we can now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1.

I will now call on those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1.

Mr. Shevchenko (Ukraine): Ukraine attaches great importance to the strengthening of international peace, security and stability at global and regional levels. We believe that the development of good-neighbourly relations among States is one of the effective ways to achieve this goal. A number of agreements concluded recently by my country with neighbouring States could be regarded in this context. Therefore, we fully share the main thrust of draft

resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1, presented by the delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The Chairman: If there are no further delegations wishing to speak, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Development of good-neighbourly relations among Balkan States", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the 17th meeting, on 7 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, it is also co-sponsored by Albania, Canada and Ukraine.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I will now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position after the decision. I see none.

That concludes the draft resolutions on which we could take action. There are still draft resolutions on which we are going to take action but which are not ready yet. In cluster 1 we have draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1; in cluster 4, L.27/Rev.1; in cluster 6, L.2, L.6 and L.43; in cluster 7, L.3, L.11/Rev.1 and L.42; and in cluster 10, L.36.

I propose that tomorrow morning we take action on draft resolutions L.27/Rev.1, L.6, L.11/Rev.1, L.42 and L.36/Rev.1. I would really appeal to delegations to submit to the Secretariat any other draft resolutions that might be ready.

I call on the representative of Colombia.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have a request concerning draft resolution L.11/Rev.1, which you mentioned among those upon which action will be taken tomorrow. Taking into account the fact that we are still conducting consultations, we would ask that the decision on that draft resolution be held in abeyance until Friday.

The Chairman: I would like to ask the representative of Colombia if L.11/Rev.1 will be ready tomorrow afternoon?

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This truly has been a process of complex consultations, and there remains one delegation that is still awaiting instructions on this. We would like to have the draft resolution adopted by consensus, and that is the reason for the delay. So, I cannot really say at this time whether we would have the necessary information tomorrow afternoon.

The Chairman: That is how costly democracy can be at times! Therefore, we will only take up four draft resolutions tomorrow: L.27/Rev.1, L.6, L.42 and L.36/Rev.1.

Now I would like to call on delegations wishing to exercise their right of reply. I call on the representative of Iraq.

Mr. Al-Anbuge (Iraq)(*interpretation from Arabic*): By an irony of fate, the Israeli representative is hurling accusations against my country that are fallacious and without foundation. It is particularly astonishing that these accusations are coming from a representative of an entity founded on aggression, expansion, occupation of the territories of others by force and by all illegal means.

To be honest, the last one entitled to speak in such a way is Israel, because everyone knows that that entity has a fearsome arsenal of nuclear weapons and stocks of other weapons of mass destruction that it uses to terrorize the States in the region. That entity has refused to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and refuses to place its nuclear installations under the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system.

I should like to conclude my statement by citing a proverb: "People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones".

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker for this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/52/PV.22

General Assembly

Official Records

Fifty-second session

First Committee

22nd Meeting
Thursday, 13 November 1997, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Nkgowe . . . . . (Botswana)

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

Agenda items 62 to 83 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: As I informed the Committee yesterday afternoon, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, L.36/Rev.1 and L.6.

I shall first call upon those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): I would like to introduce the revised draft resolution on small arms, which is contained in document A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1.

I introduced draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27 at the Committee's meeting on 6 November, and I will not repeat what I said then.

Many delegations are interested in draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27, because it is very important, and we have received some comments on it from various delegations. My delegation, together with other sponsors, tried very hard to accommodate these comments, so that the draft resolution could command overwhelming support in the Committee. After intensive consultations, we have agreed to revise the draft resolution. I would like to express my sincere gratitude for the support and flexibility which the sponsors and other delegations concerned have shown during our consultations.

In A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1 we have added a new preambular paragraph, now the fifth, which concerns the right of self-determination. This paragraph is the same as the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution two years ago, which became resolution A/50/70 B and which was adopted by an overwhelming majority. I would like to express, on behalf of the sponsors, our sincere hope that this draft resolution on small arms will also be adopted by an overwhelming majority.

The Chairman: I shall now call on delegations wishing to make general statements on any draft resolutions contained in any cluster.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I asked to speak for two purposes. First, I would like to draw attention to the revision of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.42. The revised draft resolution, document A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1, has been circulated this morning. As we indicated yesterday, the first preambular paragraph of the original draft, which referred to the report of the Secretary-General on reform, has been deleted.

With that deletion, and indeed with the conclusion of the exercise in the Working Group on the reform process, we believe that this draft resolution should now be seen independently, and we hope that all delegations will examine it on its merits.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1 are open to consultations with any delegation or delegations which may wish to suggest improvements to its text. I sincerely hope that the same constructive approach will be adopted with regard to this draft resolution as has been

97-86509 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

manifested in this Committee throughout this session on various other issues and draft resolutions that we have adopted.

In the same spirit, I would like to offer a proposal with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, which has just been introduced by the Ambassador of Japan. First, I would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to the representative of Japan and to the co-sponsors of his draft resolution for the flexibility and constructive spirit that have been displayed with regard to the changes that have been introduced into it.

The reinsertion of a reference to the principles of self-defence and the principle of self-determination in the preamble has considerably eased the difficulties that my delegation had confronted with regard to the substance of the report [A/52/298] of the Secretary-General and some of the recommendations of the Panel of Governmental Experts.

We have one problem, and that is with the paragraph in the draft resolution that endorses the recommendations of the Secretary-General's report. In order to safeguard our position, and to be in a position to support draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, I would like to suggest that a few words be added at the end of operative paragraph 1. We think they would make the draft resolution more objective and more acceptable to the membership of the Committee. I suggest that at the end of operative paragraph 1, the semi-colon should be replaced by a comma and the following should be added:

> "bearing in mind the principles referred to above and the views of Member States expressed on the recommendations;".

With this addition, which we feel would not compromise either the recommendations or their endorsement, but would safeguard the positions of those delegations which may have reservations on some of the recommendations, the draft resolution could become generally acceptable to the Committee. I very much hope that Japan and the co-sponsors can find it possible to respond positively to this proposal.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): I thank the representative of Pakistan for his very cooperative spirit on this draft resolution on small arms. At the same time, my delegation regrets his proposal to amend the draft resolution.

I understand that, in accordance with rule 120 of the rules of procedure, action on the amendment will be taken tomorrow. In the meantime, I request through you, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretariat distribute this proposed amendment in writing as soon as possible, in order for us to study carefully the representative of Pakistan's proposal.

The Chairman: Action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1 will be deferred until tomorrow.

As no other delegations wish to make general statements, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.36/Rev.1.

I call on the representative of Algeria to introduce it.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): As the Committee will recall, I introduced draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.36 on 5 November 1997, and my delegation does not intend to repeat the statement it made then. Subsequently intensive negotiations took place among the sponsors and all interested delegations with regard to the draft resolution and the revised version on which the Committee is to take a decision today. The sponsors agreed to include a new paragraph, which is now the eighth preambular paragraph.

On behalf of all the sponsors, I wish to thank all delegations for their constructive spirit and their full cooperation. With these changes, the sponsors hope and trust that the Committee can now adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

The Chairman: As no other delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.36/Rev.1, the Committee will now take action on it.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.36, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 15th meeting of the Committee on 5 November 1997. The draft resolution was sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself and in document A/C.1/INF/2. The revised version, draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.36./Rev.1, has just been introduced by the representative of Algeria.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote.

May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.36/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations that wish to explain their position or vote after the decision.

Mr. Danieli (Israel): Israel is satisfied that a draft resolution which is particularly important to all Mediterranean States has been adopted without a vote. It has already been with us for some years, and it sets out some major principles, with a view to strengthening security and promoting a multilateral action-oriented cooperative dialogue between States of the region.

The draft resolution can remain a matter for consensus as long as it is not harnessed for short-sighted objectives. It must continue to reflect the spirit in which it was conceived and adopted.

It is the position of my delegation that all security matters pertaining to the Middle East are subject to the peace process in the region as a whole. Operative paragraph 5 does not take this principle into account. It is Israel's view that primacy should be attached to regional security arrangements, which can be complemented where appropriate by endorsing global agreements.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation supports the basic thrust of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.36/Rev.1. However, we would like to go on record with our reservations about the eighth preambular paragraph, on the Middle East peace process.

The Islamic Republic of Iran has a principled position on the Middle East peace process, and does not believe that the current process will lead to the fulfilment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to speak at this stage, the Committee will proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.6.

No members of the Committee wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution, so the Committee will now take action on it.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.6, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures", was introduced by the representative of Gabon on behalf of the States members of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa at the 16th meeting of the First Committee on 6 November 1997. The draft resolution was sponsored by Gabon on behalf of the States members of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa. In connection with this draft resolution, I would like to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the programme budget implications, as contained in document A/C.1/52/L.50.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.6 was adopted.

The Chairman: As no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, and no sponsors of draft resolutions are ready to introduce them now for action, that concludes our business for today.

Tomorrow the Committee will take decisions on the remaining draft resolutions that are ready for action: draft resolutions A/C.1/52/L.43, L.2, L.3, L.11/Rev.1, L.42/Rev.1, L.51 and L/27/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

United Nations A/C.1/52/PV.23

General Assembly
Fifty-second session

Official Records

First Committee
23rd Meeting
Friday, 14 November 1997, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Nkgowe . . . . . (Botswana)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

Agenda items 62 to 83 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: This morning, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/52/L.43, L.2, L.3, L.11/Rev.1, L.42/Rev.1, L.27/Rev.1 and L.52.

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on draft resolution L.43, I shall call upon those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): I would like to propose a revision to the resolution on small arms contained in A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1. Our proposal concerns operative paragraph 1, which currently reads,

> "*Endorses* the recommendations contained in the report on small arms, which was approved unanimously by the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms".

Our proposed revision of this paragraph is to add the following words after "Governmental Experts on Small Arms":

> "bearing in mind the views of Member States on the recommendations".

That is the proposal of my delegation, with the agreement of the co-sponsors, on draft resolution L.27/Rev.1.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution on the convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, contained in document A/C.1/52/L.11/Rev.1, my delegation wishes to convey the decision of the co-sponsors to make the two following revisions to the text.

The first line of operative paragraph 1 currently states:

(*spoke in English*)

> "*Decides*, subject to the emergence of a general agreement".

The words "a general agreement" are to be deleted and replaced by the word "consensus". Operative paragraph 1 then reads:

> "*Decides*, subject to the emergence of consensus on its objectives and agenda, to convene its fourth special session devoted to disarmament".

(*spoke in Spanish*)

Likewise, we wish to make the following revision to operative paragraph 3.

(*spoke in English*)

Where the text currently reads:

"and, in the light of the outcome of the deliberations"

97-86527 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

the words "in the light of" are to be deleted and replaced by the words "subject to". Accordingly, that portion of operative paragraph 3 will read:

"and, subject to the outcome of the deliberations"

and so on.

The Chairman: Are there other delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions?

Mr. Karem (Egypt): I have the pleasure to speak today on a draft resolution submitted by Egypt under agenda item 71(*c*), entitled "Transparency in armaments" and contained in document A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

The draft resolution, as I am sure you are all aware, aims at establishing the long-awaited recognition by the General Assembly of the interrelationship between transparency in conventional weapons on the one hand and, on the other hand, transparency in weapons of mass destruction and on transfers of equipment and technology directly related to the development and manufacture of such weapons.

Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, and even before, Egypt and the rest of the Non-Aligned States have stressed every year that the concept of transparency should not be limited to conventional weapons, but should also include weapons of mass destruction — nuclear, chemical and biological — as well as transfers of high technology that has military applications.

This principled position does not in any way diminish Egypt's support for the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, nor its recognition of the need for the Register's development and expansion. This support was clearly reflected in the fact that the report of the expert group on this important matter [A/52/316, annex] was agreed to by consensus.

In our view, this draft resolution is an essential complement to the draft resolution that is adopted annually on this item and which, for this session, is contained in document A/C.1/52/L.43. Draft resolution L.43, which the General Assembly is going to adopt this session, endorses the report of the expert group and sets the tone and agenda for another expert group to be convened in the year 2000.

For this reason, we have embarked on extensive consultations with the co-sponsors of L.43, and we appreciate very much the positive spirit with which they have tried to accommodate our concerns in their draft. These consultations, as positive as they have been, have yet to lead to agreement on specific amendments or specific courses of action to be followed. At present we remain ready to consider any further compromise proposals.

Egypt shall submit to the Secretariat at the end of the day a slightly revised draft that is aimed at addressing some of the observations that have been communicated to us by some delegations. We shall open a co-sponsorship list for the draft resolution, and we urge delegations wishing to co-sponsor the draft to contact us, with a view to voting on this draft on Monday or Tuesday if no conclusive agreement is reached in the ongoing consultations. For this purpose my delegation is making available on the table at the back of the room advanced copies of the revised draft.

The Chairman: As there are no other delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions, I will now call on those delegations wishing to make general statements on any draft resolutions contained in any cluster.

Since there are none, I will now call on those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43.

A recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraphs 5(*b*) and 7. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to continue the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, it is also sponsored by Andorra, Madagascar, Saint Lucia, Guinea-Bissau and the Dominican Republic.

Now the Committee will vote on operative paragraph 5 (*b*).

Mr. Nordenfelt (Sweden): Could you, Sir, be kind enough to ask the Secretariat to read out exactly what it is in the paragraph that we are going to vote on? It starts at (*b*), I understand. Where does it end?

The Chairman: Would the Secretary of the Committee please read the paragraph.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): I am going to read operative paragraph 5 (*b*).

> "Requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2000, on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with a view to a decision at its fifty-fifth session".

So now we are voting on operative paragraph 5 (*b*).

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Mexico, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 5 (b) was retained by 127 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, which reads:

> "*Invites* the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Algeria, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 was retained by 123 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Morocco informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 as a whole.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Algeria, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Mexico, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 as a whole was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote after the decision.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China)(*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, "Transparency in armaments", as a whole and abstained in the voting on paragraphs 5 (*b*) and 7. The Chinese delegation believes that appropriate military transparency measures can help to enhance international confidence and ease tensions. Therefore, since 1992 China has participated in the various related United Nations activities, including the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

At the same time, the Chinese delegation believes that in the prevailing international circumstances no country can agree to exercise or can effectively exercise absolute transparency in armaments. We do not believe in transparency for transparency's sake. Countries have different political, military and security environments, and a uniform level of transparency would have different impacts on different countries.

Where the great Powers or members of military blocs are concerned, some level of transparency might help to enhance mutual confidence and can even be a way for them to demonstrate their military muscles and promote their

arms trade interests. However, this can only jeopardize the security of other countries. It is therefore not realistic to formulate abstract or purportedly unified measures for transparency applicable to all countries. Such an endeavour leads nowhere.

We therefore believe that applicable and relevant measures of transparency should be achieved through negotiation, within the framework of concrete arms control and disarmament treaties, taking into account the different character, nature and requirements of various existing treaties.

In the Chinese delegation's view, the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms can be a useful exercise and experiment. Leaving aside the Register's impact on arms control and disarmament and in restricting arms transfers — although that is also a question that merits our careful consideration — the operation of the Register over the past few years, judging solely from the participation in it, has shown that the system can hardly be called successful. According to the Secretary-General's report [A/52/312], 85 countries participated in the Register in 1996, less than half the membership of the United Nations. Therefore, it is urgent that we study and solve the problem of how to enhance and increase the Register's universality. Only then will it be possible for us to consider whether and how to extend its scope. To do so too early or to set a time limit for such extension would only jeopardize the Register as it now stands.

With regard to the question of including transparency in armaments in the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament next year, we believe that this is a question to be decided by the Conference on Disarmament itself through consultations with all parties. These consultations will take into consideration the other agenda items of the Conference.

As far as the Chinese delegation is concerned, the question of transparency is by no means a priority item of the Conference on Disarmament. Furthermore, an isolated discussion of transparency in armaments ignoring the concrete requirements of arms control and disarmament treaties will only meet the propaganda needs of certain countries. Apart from that, there is no other significance.

Mr. Abdel Aziz (Egypt): From 1991 to 1993, Egypt supported the annual General Assembly resolution on transparency in armaments, which, during those three years, was adopted without a vote.

However, with the realization that Egypt's commitment to comprehensive and far-reaching transparency in armaments was not met with an equal commitment on the part of others, we were forced, starting in 1994, to resort to abstaining in the voting on draft resolutions on transparency in armaments.

As in the past three years, our abstention this year is also to be seen as a reflection of our continued disappointment in the lack of progress being achieved towards the expansion and further development of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms as envisaged in General Assembly resolution 46/36 L of 1991. This lack of progress is adequately reflected in the report of the group of experts which met this year.

Two Groups of Governmental Experts appointed by the Secretary-General, an Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament, annual deliberations during the General Assembly and countless conferences and seminars on the issue have not led to any progress.

The United Nations Register remains limited to transfers of only seven categories of conventional arms and continues to ignore other types of conventional arms, as well as weapons of mass destruction and advanced technologies with military applications.

Furthermore, the Register deals less than adequately with the issues of military holdings and procurement through national production.

While the United Nations Register in its present form may meet the security concerns of certain States, it does not adequately meet those of Egypt.

Only an expanded Register which provides a comprehensive picture and covers in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner the overall military capabilities of States can serve the cause of transparency in armaments.

Until such a Register is in place or until we determine that there exists a genuine commitment among States to fully implement the provisions of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, Egypt will continue to abstain in the voting on draft resolutions on transparency in armaments.

We regret that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 have chosen to put it to the vote today, thereby preventing further consultations that could have led to reaching a text on this important agenda item.

Mr. Abou-Hadid (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We wish to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, "Transparency in armaments", which has just been adopted.

My delegation wishes to fully support the world movement towards building an international community free from the use of force and the threat of the use of force, a world where the principles of justice, equality and peace prevail.

As we confirm our willingness to participate in any international endeavour aimed, in good faith, at the realization of that aim, we wish to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the draft resolution does not take into account the special situation in the region of the Middle East, where the Arab-Israeli conflict continues.

This is because of Israel's persistence in occupying Arab territories, its refusal to implement relevant Security Council resolutions, its possession of the most lethal and dangerous weapons of mass destruction and its ability to produce, manufacture and stockpile in its territory all kinds of sophisticated weapons. Thus, transparency in the field of Israeli armaments is indeed the tip of the iceberg.

Consequently, my delegation abstained in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): I wish to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution "Transparency in armaments", contained in document A/C.1/52/L.43.

Myanmar believes that transparency in armaments can be a useful confidence-building measure provided that it is non-discriminatory, universal and on a voluntary basis.

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, contains the shortcomings present in the draft resolutions on the subject put forward at previous sessions of the General Assembly.

My delegation has reservations on operative paragraph 5 (*b*) and operative paragraph 7. In operative paragraph 5 (*b*) the General Assembly would call for the convening of a meeting of a group governmental experts in the year 2000 and would call upon the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the continued operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development.

We believe that we still need to review and reassess the operation of the Register. It is therefore premature and unnecessary at this stage to further develop the Register of Conventional Arms.

In view of the past record of the work of the Group of Governmental Experts, we also have misgivings about the effectiveness and usefulness of holding another meeting of a group of experts in this regard.

Moreover, we do not see any urgent need for the Conference on Disarmament to take up the issue of transparency in armaments, as it is called upon to do in operative paragraph 7, at a time when it ought to be concentrating on banning fissile materials, nuclear disarmament and other pressing issues.

Accordingly, my delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 5 (*b*) and operative paragraph 7, as well as on the draft resolution as whole.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain why our delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

The Islamic Republic of Iran supports transparency in armaments as a confidence-building measure. We are cognizant of the contributions that an enhanced level of transparency could make in building confidence among States and that it would help the security of States. We have participated in the Register since 1992, when it was established. However, contrary to the understanding reached in resolution 46/36 L of 1991 and the contents of that resolution, which provided for a phased transparency in armaments, including in nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction and conventional armaments, no concrete efforts have been made so far to expand the scope of the Register to include data on all categories of weapons.

Based on the operation of the Register in the past five years, there is no evidence that the Register has led to self-restraint in the transfer of conventional arms, particularly on the part of the biggest suppliers of these weapons. No rigorous efforts have been made to promote full regional participation in the Register on an equal basis, especially in regions which count for most conventional arms transfers, such as the Middle East.

With respect to specific elements of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, as a member of the Group of Governmental Experts on transparency in armaments, I should say that the Group made a valuable effort to provide a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its

further development. But it was not able to make any substantive recommendation to the General Assembly, due to divergent views on the development of the Register.

On the contribution of the work of the Conference on Disarmament on transparency in armaments, we firmly believe that the Conference has already completed its mandate on this issue. However, if there is a new proposal to discuss transparency in armaments in the Conference on Disarmament, we are ready to consider it, provided that such a proposal promotes greater transparency in nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons in a non-discriminatory manner.

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): During the course of our general debate and subsequent discussions, many delegations dealt with the subject of transparency in armaments. In the statement I made on 16 October, I explained the position of my delegation on the subject. Hence, I do not wish to refer once again to the issues phrased in that statement.

Operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution invites the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments. This invitation has to be viewed in the context of positions taken by individual delegations and groups of delegations at the current and past sessions of the General Assembly. A number of delegations referred during the debate to certain deficiencies of transparency in armaments, such as selectivity in relation to types of weapons — here, I would refer to conventional weapons, ignoring weapons of mass destruction — as well as selectivity in relation to specific weapons on which transparency is decided.

When invitations are made, such as the one in operative paragraph 7, some delegations take contradictory positions. When it suits them, they do not hesitate to invite the Conference on Disarmament or even to call upon it to take on certain tasks. The request made with regard to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in General Assembly resolution 50/65 is one such example.

On other occasions, some delegations take the position that the Conference on Disarmament is an independent organ and as such should be the master of its house, requiring no requests or invitations from the General Assembly. In doing so, they seem to forget the fact that the resources of the Conference on Disarmament come from the international community and that the Conference, as the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament issues, is responsible to the international community as a whole. If we accept the argument on the independence of the Conference on Disarmament, there is no rationale for operative paragraph 7; there is no rationale for taking the position that, on some draft resolutions, the Conference on Disarmament should be permitted to take its own decisions and that, on others, it is acceptable to invite or to call upon the Conference on Disarmament to engage itself in certain work.

The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee was decided by the Conference on Disarmament on 26 May 1992 and the heading of that decision refers to a decision on organizational arrangements in connection with General Assembly resolution 46/36 L. It is quite clear to all of us that the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee is rather dated. The sponsors should have taken into account the statements made in the Conference on Disarmament as well as during the current session, and made reference to the need to reexamine the mandate prior to undertaking any work in the field of transparency in armaments.

It is the view of this delegation that merely inviting the Conference on Disarmament year after year to consider continuing its work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments is not helping the cause of transparency or the Conference in the conduct of its work. Such a message sent from this forum is unhelpful, as it would encourage interested delegations to seek further work on transparency in armaments without addressing the validity of the mandate given to the Ad Hoc Committee in 1992.

With regard to the effort of the Register, we too share the apprehensions expressed by some delegations, though in principle we have no objection to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. We have, in the past, provided information to the Register. To achieve its objective, the Register should be expanded.

Finally, in view of the foregoing, my delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 7. Despite other deficiencies in the draft, Sri Lanka voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, as we believe that further work on transparency, on the basis of views expressed by various delegations, is desirable.

Mr. Bakiet (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Sudan voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, entitled "transparency in armaments", proceeding from its belief that transparency in armaments undoubtedly contributes to confidence-building and security throughout the world.

However, we also believe that such transparency should extend to all types of armaments, including weapons of mass destruction, so as to consolidate the principles of trust and peace among all States of the world with a view to achieving the objective which we all strive for: complete and general disarmament.

The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms in its current form lacks transparency, because the information provided to it, such as procurement from national production and military holdings, is incomplete and inaccurate and does not reflect reality. Therefore, the Sudan supported the response of the States of the Arab League to the Secretary-General regarding the Register. We also support any endeavour and proposal aimed at achieving transparency in armaments by including weapons of mass destruction in the Register or by establishing a parallel register of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The work of the Group of Governmental Experts on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, in which Cuba was represented, having been barely completed, we would have preferred that this year's draft resolution, A/C.1/52/L.43, confine itself to reflecting the results of that exercise practically and factually. This would have facilitated the adoption of a more balanced text, which would have had greater potential for support from delegations.

The main reason for our abstention on the text as a whole this year is because of my delegation's serious reservations on operative paragraph 7. As we have said in previous years, the consideration of the item on transparency was properly concluded within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. Given the current situation in the work of that forum, we cannot agree to give priority to topics that divert its attention from matters of the highest priority.

Mr. Gon (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

My delegation is of the view that if the United Nations Register system is to be supported by all Member States as a universal one, it should become a sort of disarmament, not a register per se. From its inception, my delegation was suspicious of the objectives and effectiveness of the Register system. The last several years hardened our doubt about it. Though the Register system was established, the transfer of weapons at the global level has not decreased. Instead it encouraged increased competition in the export of weapons among the big Powers and the main producers of weapons alike. The Register system has not had a direct bearing on the big Powers and the main producers of weapons, who continue in a mere pursuance of their military and political ends to transfer weapons into regions such as the Korean peninsula, where a tense situation prevails, and regions of conflict. My delegation believes that all weapons deployed in foreign countries should be resisted and their withdrawal should be promoted.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would like to explain its vote with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Algeria attaches great importance to the question of transparency and considers it a confidence-building measure, as it has always supported initiatives aimed at advancing genuine transparency, which, from our point of view, should cover all types of armaments, including weapons of mass destruction.

My delegation therefore regrets that this year, once again, it is not able to support this draft resolution which continues to provide favoured treatment to this important issue with a framework which, in our view, has shown the limits of its ability to meet the expectations of all States. We also cannot continue to support the continuation of initiatives which cannot provide an impetus for efforts aimed at truly setting up a system which is viable, effective, authentic and covers all types of weapons.

The report of the Group of Governmental Experts [A/52/316, annex] is yet one more illustration of the difficulties in achieving progress towards expanding the Register for all types of weapons.

My delegation has supported and continues to support the intensive consultations which have been held over the last few days by several delegations interested in this question. We had hoped until the very end that the efforts would be successful. At the same time, however, we remain confident regarding the continuation of these efforts to meet the concerns of delegations which, while supporting the Register, have some difficulties in agreeing with it for objective reasons as long as it is not expanded to cover other types of weapons.

For all these reasons, my delegation abstained from the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43.

Ms. Laose (Nigeria): I have asked to speak to explain Nigeria's action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Nigeria is part of the Group of 21 at the Conference on Disarmament, and we share the well-known views of other like-minded members of that Group with regard to the agenda item on transparency in armaments. It is nonetheless our hope that the obstacles before the agenda item in the Conference on Disarmament will be overcome through consultations between the members of the Conference. However, if this is not the case, we believe that a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development can still be done in the year 2000 — even if the Conference on Disarmament is unable to agree on the item on transparency in armaments.

We have therefore voted in favour of operative paragraph 5 (*b*) and abstained on operative paragraph 7. We voted in favour of the draft as a whole because we attach great importance to the question of transparency in armaments.

Mr. Al-Dayel (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments", because the United Nations Register includes seven types of conventional weapons and thus excludes weapons of mass destruction and the transfer operations for advanced technology which has military applications.

What reinforces transparency and makes it realizable is its comprehensive inclusion of all kinds of armaments because of the mutuality of relationships between transparency in conventional arms and transparency in weapons of mass destruction, as well as the transfer of advanced technology that has military applications. In this context, we emphasize the position of the member States of the League of Arab States presented to the Secretary-General in this respect.

The Chairman: As there are no other delegations wishing to speak at this stage, the Committee will now proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.3. Are there members who wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution?

As I see none, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.3. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.3, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the 17th meeting, on 7 November 1997. The draft resolution is sponsored by those countries listed in document A/C.1/52/L.3 itself and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.3 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.3 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.11/Rev.1. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.11/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Preparatory Committee for the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997.

At the 23rd meeting, on 14 November, the representative of Colombia made the following oral revisions: in paragraph 1, the word "consensus" should replace the words "a general agreement";' and in paragraph 3, the words "subject to" should replace the words "in the light of".

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.11/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution, as orally revised, be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.11/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairman: I call now on those delegations wishing to explain their positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): My delegation expresses its appreciation to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.11/Rev.1 for their extra efforts this year to develop a text that could be adopted without a vote. The

draft resolution reflects an understanding that a consensus is needed to set up a special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, that there is no point in setting a date until such consensus emerges and, finally, that hard work will be required to prepare it.

I would like to make clear, however, that United States support for this draft resolution should not be misconstrued as support for a fourth special session on disarmament. Rather, the United States supports this draft resolution because it makes clear that a fourth special session should be convened on the basis of consensus, just as were all previous special sessions on disarmament, and that it would be useful only if there was consensus on its objectives and agenda. In our view, such an agenda should be balanced and not unduly weighted towards nuclear issues. It should include, for example, items such as conventional weapons, transparency and confidence-building measures. These views were presented in detail in a working paper at the 1997 session of the Disarmament Commission.

There are also several questions that must be answered prior to any decision to convene a special session on disarmament, such as: What is the need for or intended purpose of such a session? Is the international climate propitious for the holding of such a session? What are the prospects for consensus results? Would the large costs estimated for such a meeting be justified by the results? Would a special session conflict with, be redundant to or duplicate other ongoing arms control and disarmament activities?

The adoption of this draft resolution without a vote this year indicates a broadly shared realization that we should convene a special session only when its purposes are clear and when concrete and balanced results based on consensus are possible. We hope that it indicates a shift away from pursuit of a special session on nuclear disarmament only, which appeared to be the initial impetus behind the call for a fourth special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

Mr. Millim (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): It is my honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated State of Cyprus associate themselves with this explanation of vote. The countries members of the European economic area — Iceland and Norway — also associate themselves with this statement.

The European Union is pleased that consensus has been restored on a draft resolution on this subject. We stress that our support for draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.11/Rev.1 does not imply agreement with the fifth preambular paragraph. The European Union intends at the 1998 session of the Disarmament Commission to participate in future constructive exchanges on a fourth special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

As it did last year, the European Union will make a positive contribution towards the consensus necessary for agreement on a date for a fourth special session and for the convening of the Preparatory Committee for the session. The European Union calls upon all States Members of the United Nations to work constructively to that end.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation supported the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.11/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Preparatory Committee for the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament", as orally revised.

We were pleased that in the course of consultations at this session it was possible to draft a text that enjoys general support. We also would like to reiterate our opinion that the decision to convene a special session can be adopted only after a consensus has been reached as to the objectives of the agenda and the dates for the session.

Mr. Danieli (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on this draft resolution. However, Israel disassociates itself from the content of the fifth preambular paragraph. It also shares the points made and the concerns expressed by previous delegations which explained their vote on this draft resolution.

The Chairman: If there are no further speakers who wish to explain their vote after the voting, the Committee will proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1.

I now call on delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1, as we have

always supported the existing international disarmament machinery and the important role that the United Nations plays in it. We agree with the provisions of the draft resolution — that is to say, that the Conference on Disarmament is the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. Emphasis on this issue at this time is opportune, because the Conference on Disarmament right now is encountering some difficulties in preparing its future course of action on banning nuclear tests.

We do not agree with those who wish to avail themselves of those difficulties to set up various special tribunes to speed matters up, without basing themselves on consensus, with a view to reaching agreements which, as experience has taught us, cannot take into account the security interests of all countries.

The United Nations Secretariat here must focus on providing all with the services that are indispensable to the functioning of the Conference on Disarmament. That is where the disarmament experts from all countries truly are focused.

I should like to reaffirm the recognized role of the Conference on Disarmament. This draft resolution before us, L.42/Rev.1, is a step in the right direction. We have also noted that the co-sponsors of L.42/Rev.1 deleted the first preambular paragraph in the original text, thereby avoiding the reproach that the First Committee overlaps work done elsewhere pertaining to the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Renewing the United Nations: a Programme for Reform" [A/51/950]. We deem this to be along the right lines. It removes doubts about the draft resolution that might exist for those who oppose such overlapping, including our own delegation.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): The United States will vote no on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1 on the role of the United Nations in disarmament. This is because in our view it intrudes on the larger efforts at United Nations reform, which are more properly the work of the General Assembly, as evidenced by the consensus approval of General Assembly draft resolution A/52/L.17 just two days ago.

We are maintaining this position even after the removal of the first preambular paragraph. The elimination of this paragraph merely drops the explicit link to the Secretary-General's reform efforts. The remainder of the draft resolution implicitly still attempts to influence that effort. Therefore, although it contains a few useful points, the United States cannot support the draft resolution as a whole and will continue to work in the General Assembly plenary to manage the reform effort in an across-the-board manner. We urge others to do the same and to vote no with us on draft resolution L.42/Rev.1.

Ms. Hand (Australia): Australia will vote against this draft resolution, because we adhere strictly to the view that United Nations reform issues -- which encompass the role of the United Nations in disarmament — should be considered in the context of the Secretary-General's Track II package. They are under the authority of the General Assembly, not its committees. They concern the vision by Member States for the United Nations as a whole and should be dealt with as a package, not picked apart by committees.

We also have concerns about the contents of the draft resolution. While many of the substantive elements are unobjectionable in themselves, the overall intention of the draft resolution is clearly to discourage the Secretary-General from his proposals to strengthen the Secretariat's advisory capacity in the area of disarmament. In adhering so rigidly to the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, the draft resolution ignores more modern mandates based on General Assembly resolutions. It also ignores that the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) itself has called for updating the disarmament agenda and machinery of the United Nations through a further special session on disarmament. It imposes an artificial schedule of priority on disarmament issues. Finally, operative paragraph 8 perpetuates the myth that the Secretary-General plans a super-verification role for the Secretariat.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1. This is because, first of all, the Chinese delegation believes that the draft resolution is not in conflict with the ongoing reform of the United Nations. However the United Nations is to be reformed, such reform should only improve the role and status of the United Nations disarmament machinery instead of weakening it, and I do not think it will weaken it.

Secondly, the disarmament machinery mentioned in L.42/Rev.1 should not only continue to exist, but its role should be further strengthened.

Thirdly, the draft resolution's references to compliance with treaties has the full endorsement of the Chinese delegation, because we firmly believe that the existing international treaties governing international disarmament should be faithfully adhered to.

Fourthly, the Chinese delegation believes that the United Nations Secretariat should, in accordance with authorization by the General Assembly, provide support and services to the existing disarmament machinery. The work of the Secretariat should under no circumstances replace the sovereign States in the exercise of their functions.

Ms. Mshai Tolle (Kenya): Kenya will vote in favour of this resolution because we believe that the United Nations has a role to play in disarmament through its existing machinery. As a member of the Conference on Disarmament, my country holds the view that this is an important forum for negotiating treaties that touch on national security interests. My delegation has carefully studied the draft resolution before us, L.42/Rev.1, particularly operative paragraph 7, which reaffirms that the Conference on Disarmament is the sole negotiating body for disarmament.

Furthermore, following the deletion of the first preambular paragraph, we see no conflict between this resolution and the ongoing reforms currently being addressed by the General Assembly. We therefore hope that the resolution will enjoy the widest support.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "Role of the United Nations in disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 21st meeting, on 12 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, it is also co-sponsored by Cuba.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Canada, Georgia, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Uruguay

The draft resolution was adopted by 93 votes to 42, with 9 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote after the decision.

Mr. Dean (Canada): The Canadian delegation must acknowledge its difficulty with this draft resolution. There is much in it with which we agree. However, despite the changes made to the draft, Canada believes that the substance of this resolution is related closely to two other matters.

First, the Secretary-General has recommended that the General Assembly undertake a review of the work of both the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee with a view to updating, rationalizing and strengthening their work. This needs to be done, and the Secretary-General's

reforms are, in fact, being considered elsewhere. In this light, we welcomed the proposal by Pakistan to delete the first preambular paragraph.

Secondly, with regard to the First Committee's own deliberations on the rationalization of its work and reform of its agenda, on 3 November Canada presented a paper to this Committee containing its views. We believe that action on these more specific issues could and should be taken now. We support your efforts, Sir, in this regard.

In conclusion, the substantive matters dealt with in draft resolution L.42/Rev.1 need comprehensive and careful consideration. We believe that, in fact, this has yet to occur during this General Assembly. Canada has therefore abstained on this resolution.

Mr. Millim (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): The European Union has taken note of the improvements made by the co-sponsors to the preambular part of draft resolution L.42/Rev.1. We have noted certain positive elements in the draft. However, the text as a whole still causes some important problems of principle which impel us, at this late stage, to vote against it.

Mr. Goosen (South Africa): In the general debate of this year's General Assembly, and also in the First Committee, South Africa made clear its support for the Secretary-General's reform initiatives in the area of disarmament. It is our view that draft resolution L.42/Rev.1, entitled "Role of the United Nations in disarmament", is an endeavour to retain the status quo in the United Nations disarmament machinery, without taking into account — and by implication denying — the Secretary-General's proposals in this regard.

Furthermore, my delegation also wishes to note the existence of resolution 52/12, entitled "Renewing the United Nations: a programme for reform", which was adopted by consensus in the General Assembly on 12 November 1997. For these reasons, my delegation had instructions to vote against this resolution.

Mr. Pearson (New Zealand): New Zealand welcomes the Secretary-General's reforms. We strongly welcome and support them because we believe very much in the goal of a more effective and strengthened United Nations.

We also support the Secretary-General's proposals which relate to disarmament, and we agree fully with the approach being taken to deal with the reforms as a package in plenary meetings of the General Assembly. In that approach we will need, of course, to be mindful of the validity of existing arrangements, but we should not start from the premise that these cannot be questioned. Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.47 is backward-looking by seeking to do just that.

The General Assembly only this week adopted by consensus a resolution which specifically stresses that the actions will be implemented with full respect for relevant mandates. It also affirms the programmatic implications of relevant actions in the reform package. We consider, therefore, that draft resolution L.42/Rev.1 is superfluous. Moreover, we believe that submitting it in this Committee is not helpful to the wider process of achieving reform. We were obliged, therefore, to join others in opposing it.

Mr. Danieli (Israel): Israel voted against draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1. Israel dissociates itself from the main thrust, explicit or implicit, of that draft resolution, from some of its provisions and from much of its language. My delegation believes that the draft resolution is superfluous and adds nothing to the functioning of disarmament machinery.

Mr. Uluçevik (Turkey): Turkey voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1. My delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the sponsors of the draft for the improvement they made in the original text, thus facilitating my delegation's decision to vote in favour of it.

We believe that the main thrust of the draft resolution is in keeping with earlier General Assembly resolutions, including those of the special sessions devoted to disarmament. The draft resolution also once again reaffirms the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. Moreover, in our view, the draft resolution is not in conflict with the Secretary-General's reform programme.

Mr. Abdulai (Ghana): I wish to explain why my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1. We do not see in what way the draft resolution contradicts the fact that we have decided to discuss reform in the General Assembly. We believe that the reform covers all aspects of the work of the Organization, and it is an ongoing process. If we continue the habit of linking draft resolutions with which we do not agree to reform in order to prevent their discussion in committees, we will be doing the Organization a disservice, since we do not expect its work to be halted pending an exercise that is not supposed to end today or tomorrow.

Therefore, the support of my delegation for the reform effort cannot be questioned by anybody. Like others, we joined the consensus in the decision regarding the reform process in the General Assembly.

Mr. Villarga-Delgado (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation shares various points expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42/Rev.1. Nevertheless, we think that the draft resolution does not take sufficient account of the reform programme undertaken by the Secretary-General. For that reason, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, "Small arms".

I call upon delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before the voting.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): This is not an explanation of vote. I merely wanted to inform the Committee that following the acceptance by the principal sponsor of the draft resolution, following the change in operative paragraph 1 introduced by the representative of Japan, adding the words "bearing in mind the views of Member States on the recommendations" to the end of that paragraph, my delegation has decided, in a spirit of cooperation, not to press the draft amendment to that paragraph that we had submitted [A/C.1/52/L.52]. With this change, my delegation would be able to go along with the draft resolution.

Mr. Tan (Singapore): My country will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, but I would like to take this opportunity to explain our vote.

Singapore recognizes that there is a need to curb small arms obtained through illicit means, given their destabilizing implications for regional and international security, especially when such arms could fall into the hands of terrorists, drug traffickers and underground organizations. We also recognize the potential danger of the excessive and destabilizing accumulation and transfer of small arms and light weapons.

Singapore therefore supports any measures aimed at stopping the illicit international arms trade and the destabilizing accumulation. That is why we support draft resolution L.27/Rev.1. If the opportunity arises, we are prepared to participate in the Panel of Governmental Experts and any other meetings on the issue in order to contribute constructively to the process.

Nevertheless, Singapore is of the view that proposals to reduce the illicit transfer of small arms and light weapons and the approach to controlling the destabilizing accumulation should not impinge on the national security interests of States. We would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which reaffirms the inherent right to individual or collective self-defence. We also welcome the amendment submitted by the Ambassador of Japan at the last meeting to insert a new fifth preambular paragraph that clearly recognizes the legitimate right of self-defence of States. States should retain a legitimate right to use and procure all such arms and weapons for their legitimate defence purposes, as inscribed in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. Soutar (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): I wish to explain our vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1.

The United Kingdom strongly supports both the work of the Panel of Experts and the recommendations made in the Secretary-General's report on small arms and will therefore be voting in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

However, we did not wish to see any caveat attached to the draft resolution's endorsement of the recommendations contained in the report, and we regret that it has been necessary to make the changes in operative paragraph 1. As a result of those changes, the United Kingdom wishes to withdraw its co-sponsorship of L.27/Rev.1.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): I should like clarification on what we are discussing because this morning I proposed the insertion of some words in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1.

Are we in fact considering L.27/Rev.1 as orally amended in my intervention this morning, or are we considering the original L.27/Rev.1? Of course, we would prefer — and as supported by the representative of Pakistan — that L.27/Rev.1 as orally amended be the subject of action in the Committee now.

The Chairman: That is precisely how we are proceeding.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): It is with some regret that I must ask the Secretariat to have the record

reflect that the United States is no longer able to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27.

Unfortunately, the language proposed by Pakistan which has just been incorporated in Rev.2 causes us some concern and forces us to withdraw our sponsorship. It muddies what had been a very clear paragraph endorsing the recommendations contained in the consensus report of the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms. The paragraph can be read to imply that the General Assembly endorses only the portions of the experts' report which fully coincide with the views of all Member States, a position which the United States rejects.

The United States strongly supports efforts to address the problems posed by small arms, and we participated in the 1997 Expert Panel. Therefore, my delegation still supports the draft resolution and will vote in favour.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on this draft resolution.

We have studied the report of the Secretary-General prepared with the help of the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms, and we have several observations on the report and on the draft resolution introduced by the representative of Japan.

It is our view that the Committee must observe the principle that once a group of experts has concluded its work, Member States must have the opportunity to study the reports closely and to formulate their views and policies before being asked to endorse or reject the results.

Pakistan has always considered the issue of conventional armaments to be important, and this is evident from our resolutions which address both the nuclear and conventional issues. We have also supported other resolutions on the subject, and in this context I should like to express my particular appreciation for the flexibility displayed by the German delegation regarding the draft resolution on practical measures for disarmament.

Pakistan, as one of the largest contributors to United Nations peacekeeping missions, is fully cognizant of the dangers created by the indiscriminate proliferation of small arms in conflict situations which the United Nations has had to deal with. We therefore consider this subject to be of legitimate importance for careful and considered study and deliberation amongst Member States.

However, there is general recognition that this issue involves complex factors and dynamics requiring a long and evolutionary process before we can take firm decisions. Several of the recommendations of the Expert Panel implicitly recognized this fact.

However, there are other recommendations which appear to us to be entirely impractical at this stage. Yet, this draft resolution has sought their endorsement. It calls for a review of their implementation. It further calls for a report on undefined "further actions recommended to be taken". This is not a feasible approach, and the desire for such quick results instead of promoting progress could lead to impeding it.

Pakistan also objects to the selective political approach adopted by the experts in identifying specific regions, even though there was no authoritative representation from these regions on the panel.

It is for this reason that, as a minimum, my delegation had insisted on conditioning the endorsement of the recommendations with the views of Member States. If this had not been included, my delegation could not have supported this draft resolution.

We will now vote in favour of the draft resolution, but we do so in the context of the remarks and reservations I have just expressed.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico supports the adoption of this draft resolution as revised. Mexico attaches great importance to the problem of the proliferation and excessive accumulation of all arms, including small arms, and of the dangerous impact of the illicit trade in weapons with regard to the increase and heightened threat of criminal activities, the drug trade in particular.

Today in Washington, the Organization of American States (OAS) will sign a convention against the illicit trades in weapons and their components and munitions, which was an initiative of the Rio Group. The signing of this OAS convention will be attended by the President of Mexico.

There can be no doubt about Mexico's interest in this item, but we were not invited to participate in the Panel of Governmental Experts. We are carefully studying the Panel's report and should have liked to have the opportunity to obtain the opinions of all the experts from our various ministries before the General Assembly endorsed all the Panel's recommendations. Thus, we can

support the draft resolution only with the reservation that we are endorsing recommendations, the contents and implications of which we have not had time to study properly.

Mr. Cordeiro (Brazil) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to point out that Brazil's view is very similar to that just expressed by the representative of Mexico.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the fifth preambular paragraph.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, entitled "Small arms", was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, except the United Kingdom and the United States, it is also co-sponsored by Benin, Guyana, Haiti.

Earlier in this meeting, the representative of Japan made an oral revision to operative paragraph 1, as follows. At the end of operative paragraph 1, the following phrase should be added:

> "bearing in mind the views of the Member States on the recommendations".

The Committee is voting first on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

> "*Reaffirming also* the right of self-determination of all peoples, in particular peoples under colonial or other forms of alien domination or foreign occupation, and the importance of the effective realization of this right, as enunciated, *inter alia*, in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights on 25 June 1993,".

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Japan on a point of order.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): I am sorry to intervene. Japan and other co-sponsors have not asked for a separate vote on the fifth preambular paragraph. Is there any other delegation that wanted a separate vote?

The Chairman: Yes. To my understanding, the delegation of France has asked for a separate vote.

I call on the representative of Jordan on a point of order.

Mr. Abu-Nimah (Jordan): If people want to explain their vote before the voting, does this apply also to explaining their vote before the vote on the fifth preambular paragraph on its own?

The Chairman: You could have explained your vote, but it is too late now, because we are now in the process of voting.

I give the floor to the representative of Pakistan on a point of order.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): The rules of procedure say that any representative has the right to explain his vote, either before or after the voting, when that vote is taken. The Committee was not aware that a separate vote would be taken on the fifth preambular paragraph. Now that that vote is being taken, any representative who wishes to explain his vote, either before or after the voting, can do so, and I believe that the representative of Jordan has the right to do so. And by the way, my delegation would also like to do so.

The Chairman: I appreciate the point raised by the representative of Pakistan. We cannot go back to explanations of vote once we have started the voting process and the Secretary is given the floor. We had a list of speakers to explain their votes and it was exhausted without any deliberation.

The Ambassador of Jordan was raising a point of order, not necessarily saying that they wanted to explain their vote.

I call on the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): With all due respect, that is not the interpretation of the rules that has been made in this house for many years; but I do not wish to enter into a procedural debate, so I shall defer to your wisdom.

The Chairman: I thank the representative of Pakistan for his understanding.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on the fifth preambular paragraph, as I read out.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Greece, India, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Monaco, Paraguay, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 120 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nigeria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Bahrain, Israel, Mongolia, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nigeria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes after the voting.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of the entire draft resolution on small arms, but we did not take part in the voting on the fifth preambular paragraph.

The Chinese delegation would like to thank the Panel of Governmental Experts for its efforts during the past year. We agree in principle with the analysis made in the Panel's report regarding the consequences of the excessive accumulation and illicit transfer of small arms. The Chinese delegation also believes that the excessive accumulation and excessive transfer of small arms may bring about a worsening of the situation in troubled regions, increased conflict and further spreading of terrorism and drug trafficking, and thus impede the economic and social development of the regions concerned. Their impact on the developing countries in conflict regions may be even greater.

China respects and will actively support the efforts made by the international community, particularly the developing countries and regions, for peace and development.

The Chinese delegation believes that the causes which give rise to turmoil and conflict in the regions concerned — such as political, economic and social causes, including territorial disputes and religious conflicts — are complex and varied. The accumulation of small arms per se cannot give rise to conflicts; at most the matter is but a symptom rather than the root cause. To resolve the problem of the excessive accumulation and illicit transfer of small arms, it is advisable to treat both the symptom and the root cause, with the emphasis on the root cause.

One should make specific analyses of the causes underlying turmoil in different regions and work out different measures according to varying circumstances, including different approaches in handling small arms. In handling the excessive accumulation and illicit transfer of small arms, we should first and foremost refrain from going against the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and respect in earnest the sovereignty of the countries concerned.

Secondly, we should act strictly in accordance with the authorization of the United Nations Security Council and within the peacekeeping framework.

Thirdly, we should respect and act according to the agreements reached voluntarily among the parties to a conflict, including those agreements reached by the regional organizations in the regions where they are located.

Fourthly, we should take full account of the reasonable needs of the countries in conflict regions for legitimate self-defence and security.

The Chinese delegation is in favour of a proper handling of the problem of the excessive accumulation of small arms. We are firmly against acts by any country which contravene international law or the international obligations it has undertaken, be they through the illicit transfer of any arms or the use of arms transfers in gross interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State, or through undermining and impeding the efforts by a sovereign State for its national unification and territorial integrity.

We understand, sympathize with and support the countries and peoples which once experienced conflicts and wars in their efforts and specific measures to maintain and consolidate peace. But we should be vigilant about any possible attempt to use the excessive accumulation and illicit transfer of small arms as a pretext for changing the focus and objectives of international arms control and disarmament. We must also be careful about taking advantage of the troubles faced by others in an attempt to meddle in and control the internal affairs of countries in a troubled region and thus to establish or expand political influence and spheres of influence. We must moreover be vigilant about attempts to strip small and medium-sized countries of the military means necessary for legitimate self-defence and for the maintenance of their security.

Although the Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, I wish to note that

the Chinese delegation has serious reservations about the Panel's recommendation on extending to other regions an approach to solving the problems of one specific country or region.

My delegation did not participate in the vote on the fifth preambular paragraph because it required further time to study the implications of that paragraph.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation had intended to support the initial version of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27, but the sponsors revised it by adding a fifth preambular paragraph that changed the nature of the text. Although the provisions of the fifth preambular paragraph are not in themselves a problem for us, their inclusion in a draft resolution on small arms is inappropriate.

Our major concern was the revision to operative paragraph 1 made yesterday by one delegation. We were therefore obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1.

Mr. Abdel Aziz (Egypt): Following its abstention on a similar text in 1995, Egypt decided this year to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, entitled "Small arms". This testifies to Egypt's steadfast commitment to the pursuit of all efforts that can lead us to a safer and more stable world. While Egypt is encouraged by the work of the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms and by the recommendations in its report, it will nevertheless continue to monitor closely the issue of small arms in order to ensure that it is dealt with in a just, balanced, non-discriminatory and comprehensive manner. It is Egypt's ardent hope that the issue of small arms will not go down the road of other issues such as transparency in armaments, an issue which is, to our great regret, being addressed in a highly selective manner.

The priorities in the field of disarmament remain the same: nuclear weapons must be eliminated on a priority basis. Efforts at non-proliferation, while necessary, do not replace concrete and irreversible disarmament measures. Other weapons of mass destruction must also be eliminated comprehensively. Conventional weapons must be dealt with, but not in a selective manner. Small arms do not exist only in conflict-ridden countries of the developing world; controlling the transfer of such arms should not be viewed as an opportunity to curb the Charter-based right of all States, including developing States, to acquire the means for their own legitimate self-defence. Furthermore, small arms do not necessarily mean primitive arms or simple arms. There exist today small arms which are highly advanced and lethal, and which must be taken as falling within the purview of the small arms issue.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): This is a bit of restating the obvious, but I just wanted to make the record clear. Of course, the United States strongly supports the principle of self-determination. We merely abstained in the vote on the fifth preambular paragraph because we felt that the mention of that principle in a draft resolution on small arms was not appropriate.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Thanks to the revision of paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, my delegation was able to vote in favour of the draft resolution. We believe that the First Committee should take due account of the work of the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms, which will facilitate subsequent consideration of the recommendations that will appear in its final report. We view as positive the draft resolution's explicit references to the right to individual or collective self-defence and to the need for a balanced and non-discriminatory approach to the control of small arms.

I wish to make it very clear that my delegation's affirmative vote can in no way be interpreted as constituting a commitment by Cuba to automatic implementation of recommendations that will appear in the final report of the Panel of Governmental Experts. Those recommendations will require careful consideration by Member States before any final decisions on implementation are adopted.

Mr. Danieli (Israel): My delegation abstained in the votes on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, as orally revised, and on the fifth preambular paragraph. My delegation does not agree with the introduction of the fifth preambular paragraph, which in our view has no place in the context of a draft resolution specifically on small arms. Israel expresses its views on the issue of self-determination in the discussions in the Third Committee. Had the fifth preambular paragraph been deleted, my delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): My delegation voted in favour of the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, on "Small arms". We consider that that preambular paragraph was an important addition by the sponsors, and was highly instrumental in enabling my delegation to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

We believe that the principle of self-determination, which is contained in the Charter, is most relevant to the issue of small arms. I think that history will show that all struggles for self-determination and independence, including great revolutionary wars of independence, were fought with small arms and not with weapons of mass destruction.

Therefore, we believe that this insertion in the draft resolution is important and relevant, and no recommendation on the issue of small arms can or should in any way prejudice the right of peoples under foreign and colonial domination to seek their independence and freedom from such foreign occupation.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): We voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1, as revised this morning. Our affirmative vote does not mean that we have given an endorsement to the report of the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms, which has not been considered by the experts in my own country.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/52/PV.24

General Assembly
Fifty-second session

Official Records

First Committee
24th Meeting
Monday, 17 November 1997, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Nkgowe . . . . . (Botswana)

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

Agenda items 62 to 83 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: In accordance with the adopted programme of work and timetable, this afternoon the Committee will continue its action on all draft resolutions submitted under all agenda items.

As I informed members of the Committee at our meeting on Friday, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, L.28/Rev.1, L.48 and L.51/Rev.1, in that order.

Before giving the floor to delegations wishing to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, I will give the floor to the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs to make a comment on document A/52/309/Add.1.

Mr. Davinic (Director, Centre for Disarmament Affairs): Mr. Chairman, as you said, I would like to draw the Committee's attention to a document that has just been released under the symbol A/52/309/Add.1, which is the report of the Secretary-General on the work of Regional Centres. The origin of this report — in other words, the reasons why the Secretary-General submitted this report — are explained in paragraphs 6 and 7.

Let me briefly recount these reasons. In his proposed programme budget for the biennium 1998-1999, the Secretary-General recommended certain cuts in the posts of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs. In fact, he proposed that the posts of the Directors of the three Regional Centres should be abolished. In considering this proposal, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions held discussions which resulted in its report to the Fifth Committee which, *inter alia*, states,

> "that the proposal of the Secretary-General to abolish the centres should be drawn to the attention of the First Committee and that before the General Assembly takes a decision on the matter, the Secretary-General should provide additional information on the status of voluntary contributions and, as concerns Lomé, the status of discussions with UNDP." [A/52/7 (Chap. II, Part II), para. II.12]

This is a rather important issue, and the Secretary-General, in compliance with this request, has prepared this report detailing the status of voluntary contributions to the three Regional Centres and also explaining the status of his discussions with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in order possibly to provide financial resources for the work of the Regional Centre in Lomé.

It is quite obvious that the Committee will not be able to hold substantive discussions on this report, because this is the last day of its work. Nevertheless, I would appeal to the members of the First Committee to apprise themselves of the content of this report. And since the work of the Fifth Committee on this issue is not yet over, they might wish to give appropriate instructions to their representatives in that Committee to take appropriate positions on this proposal.

97-86545 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

I should like, however, to emphasize once again that the Secretary-General is not proposing that the three Regional Centres be abolished. He is proposing that the three posts of Director of these Regional Centres be abolished for the time being due to a lack of financial resources from extra-budgetary sources, which are the primary source of their funding. The report contains a graphic presentation of the state of voluntary contributions and also explains, as I have already pointed out, where we stand in our discussions with UNDP aimed at securing a possible financial contribution for the work of the Centre in Lomé.

The Chairman: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Abdel Aziz (Egypt): I have the pleasure to speak today on behalf of the delegations of Costa Rica, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia and Egypt in submitting the revised draft resolution on agenda item 71(c), entitled "Transparency in armaments", as contained in document A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, dated 14 November 1997.

The revised draft resolution is a clear expression by the sponsors of their firm belief in the interrelationship between transparency in conventional weapons on the one hand and transparency in weapons of mass destruction and transfers of equipment and technologies directly related to the development and manufacturing of such weapons on the other hand. The draft also stresses the need to address the question of transparency in armaments in a balanced manner that takes into account this interrelationship.

I am sure that all my colleagues here still remember that our agreement to establish the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms in the aftermath of the Gulf war was reached on the understanding that extensive efforts would be made to have weapons of mass destruction included in an expanded scope of the Register. This understanding is clearly reflected in General Assembly resolution 46/36 L and in subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly on this item.

Despite repeated reaffirmations every year and despite extensive discussions of this subject in the panels of experts established by the Secretary-General in 1994 and 1997, respectively, no improvement has been achieved in this regard. For that reason, the sponsors felt it imperative to supplement the annual resolution adopted on this subject with another draft resolution stressing the relationship between these two aspects and requesting the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on ways and means of enhancing transparency in the fields of weapons of mass destruction and transfers of equipment and technologies directly related to the development and manufacturing of such weapons, with a view to addressing the concerns of Member States not participating in the Register and thus also enhancing transparency in the field of conventional weapons.

It is no secret that States that are against transparency in the field of weapons of mass destruction or against the linkage between transparency in such weapons and transparency in conventional weapons are the same States that do not depend only on the Register in addressing their security concerns, but depend first and foremost on military alliances and agreements that provide them with advantages over a large number of Members of the United Nations. These advantages are clear, mutual and non-discriminatory commitments that lead eventually to security.

The sponsors of the draft resolution had hoped that their point of view would be incorporated in draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, but despite the negotiations conducted in a positive atmosphere with the sponsors of that resolution, they insisted on putting that draft to the vote on Friday. Therefore, we find it necessary to present our draft today, with slight modifications. The modifications introduced in the revised version are aimed at limiting the scope of the draft resolution to weapons of mass destruction and to transfers of equipment and technologies directly related only to the development and manufacture of such weapons.

This change should not in any way be interpreted as a change in our position calling for transparency in all transfers of high technology with military applications. It should be looked at as limiting the scope of this draft resolution only to transparency in all issues related to weapons of mass destruction on the understanding that transparency in transfers of other high technologies with military applications shall be dealt with in other resolutions.

With this introduction, I recommend that all Member States that support the principle of transparency in armaments without selectivity vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: I now give the floor to those delegations wishing to make general statements.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): My delegation would like briefly to comment on the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/52/309/Add.1, and we would also like to refer to the comments just made by the Director of the Centre for Disarmament.

I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that last Friday, we adopted draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.3 on the work of the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific. We would like to stress here that the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific is run entirely on the basis of voluntary contributions and that the Member States of the region are highly appreciative of the activities and the work of the Centre. So, since it is run entirely on voluntary contributions, we would like to see the continuation of the work of the Regional Centre.

From the comment made by the Director of the Centre for Disarmament, we understand that the Secretary-General is considering abolishing the post of Director. As we would like to see the continuation of the work of the Regional Centre, we believe that the post of Director should be retained.

Although we understand the measures for financial stringency, we believe that we should also take into account the performance of the Regional Centre. So it is the wish of my delegation that we should retain the post of Director for the Regional Centre in Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I would like to take this opportunity to make some comments on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, which is sponsored by Japan and other delegations.

It is natural to expect Japan to take the initiative for nuclear disarmament, since the Japanese people were the victims of the only two instances when nuclear weapons have actually been used, resulting in millions of casualties in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The objective of nuclear disarmament has also been accorded the highest priority by the world community, including at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and reaffirmed by the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, by the Canberra Commission and by the Non-Aligned Movement.

It is unfortunate that in order to elicit support for this initiative from the nuclear-weapon States, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 has been formulated in a way that is unlikely to advance its principal objective. Instead of addressing nuclear disarmament, the draft resolution focuses on nuclear non-proliferation. This is equated with nuclear disarmament in the last preambular paragraph.

The very first operative paragraph of the draft resolution urges universal ratification of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), while the call for reduction of nuclear weapons is relegated to operative paragraph 2. This is inexplicable. The non-proliferation cart cannot be put before the nuclear-disarmament horse. By doing so the draft resolution appears to endorse the unacceptable excuse advanced by some nuclear Powers — that is, that they cannot agree to nuclear disarmament because of the danger of nuclear proliferation.

Moreover, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 — while repeatedly welcoming various steps taken towards nuclear-arms reductions by the major nuclear Powers and progress on non-proliferation issues, such as the indefinite extension of the NPT and the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty — studiously omits even taking note of the several negative developments of which we are all aware, such as the assertion by some nuclear-weapon States that they will continue to retain nuclear weapons indefinitely; the continued testing of nuclear weapons under the cover of programmes ostensibly meant to keep such weapons reliable; the development of new nuclear weapons designed for actual use in war; the approval of war-fighting doctrines envisaging the use of such weapons against nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States; the threats held out of the possible use of nuclear weapons, including against non-nuclear-weapon States in case of the use or the threat of use of other weapons of mass destruction; and the extension of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence to expanded and renewed military alliances.

It is notable that the draft resolution does not renounce the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and nuclear threat espoused by some nuclear-weapon States and military alliances.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that the nuclear-weapon States which have I have mentioned do not have any difficulty in supporting the draft resolution in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1. Indeed, they may see it as an alibi for resisting the call for multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament

and for rejecting proposals for a programme for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, with our without a time-bound framework.

It was for these reasons that Pakistan was compelled this year to propose the amendments contained in document A/C.1/52/L.48. Over the course of the past week we have had extensive consultations on these amendments and on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 with the Japanese and other delegations. I wish to thank all those delegations, including one nuclear-weapon State, which were prepared to support these amendments. However, in response to an appeal made by Japan, my Government has decided not to press the amendments in A/C.1/52/L.48 to a vote. Yet, for the reasons I have explained, the delegation of Pakistan will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution; and if operative paragraph 1 is voted on separately we shall be obliged to vote against it, since it does not belong in this draft resolution.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): Since the delegation of Pakistan submitted the proposed amendments, contained in document A/C.1/52/L.48, to the draft resolution sponsored by Japan and others, contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, the delegations of Pakistan and Japan have been engaged in extensive consultations in order to find a solution to this matter.

In the consultations, which lasted more than a week, my delegation stressed the great importance that my country attached to this draft resolution aimed at the elimination of nuclear weapons — corresponding to the first such draft resolution adopted in the First Committee and in the General Assembly, in 1994, and to the others adopted in the following two years. The Pakistani delegation explained its views on the draft resolution in detail.

I am certain that our candid exchange of views was extremely useful for both our countries, and today I have the pleasure of informing the First Committee that, as the representative of Pakistan stated just now, we have reached a mutual understanding.

I take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the delegation of Pakistan, and especially to Mr. Munir Akram for his constructive attitude in conducting the consultations and for his spirit of cooperation and understanding in making the decision not to pursue the proposed amendment.

Now we are ready to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, and my delegation sincerely hopes that it will be adopted with as many positive votes as possible.

Mr. Afeto (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to comment on the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/52/309/Add.1, on the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean. As members know, no item on the regional centre in Africa appears on the agenda of the First Committee at this session: the Secretary-General has been requested to submit a report on this item to the General Assembly at its fifty-third session. Hence, we were rather surprised to be presented with this report, especially at this very late stage in our work.

When he introduced the report this afternoon, the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs spoke of the abolition of the posts of Centre Directors. But paragraph 11 of the report states with reference to the Lomé Centre that in the absence of funding the operations of the Centre might have to be suspended as of 1 January 1998. Is it the post of Director or the very operations of the Centre that are in question here? This is unclear.

We must be told clearly whether this item appears on the agenda of the Fifth Committee; it is certainly not on the agenda of the First Committee this year.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): I too wish to comment on the report contained in document A/52/309/Add.1, which was introduced by the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs this afternoon. As the representative of Myanmar has said, we unanimously adopted last Friday draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.3, on the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific. Moreover, many representatives spoke highly of the performance of the centres, as does the report of the Secretary-General. I too fail to understand why the Director has introduced this report at this late date.

Echoing the remarks of the representative of Myanmar, I should like to request that the activities of the Kathmandu Centre continue and that the post of Director not be abolished.

Mr. Miranda (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Like other speakers, I wish to comment on the statement made earlier by the Director of the Centre for Disarmament

Affairs. We are struck by the fact that this proposal was sent to the Fifth Committee without being simultaneously put before the First Committee, even though there was sufficient time to do this, and that, after the Fifth Committee had discussed the matter, the report in question was dated only last Friday: the penultimate day of our work — should the Committee complete its work today.

I do not want to address the reasons why the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, with its headquarters at Lima, is unable to continue its activities; although it had resources for several years, it had no Director appointed by the Secretary-General during that time. Yet I would like to say that, as the report of the Secretary-General notes, there have been contacts between the Secretariat and several countries of the region with a view to reactivating the activities of the Centre. It therefore seems to us inappropriate to adopt the Secretary-General's proposal to abolish the post of Director.

We reserve our right to give document A/52/309/Add.1 more careful study and to make further comments at a later stage.

The Chairman: I call on the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs.

Mr. Davinic (Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs): A number of questions pertaining to the work of the regional centres have been raised. I must fully agree with the statement of the representative of Togo that the First Committee did not have on its agenda an item dealing with two of the three centres: those located in Lomé and in Lima. The one that was on the agenda for this year was the Kathmandu Centre, on which the Committee expressed itself in a draft resolution adopted by consensus last week.

We are actually dealing with several different issues here. The Secretary-General is pursuing two parallel activities. One is pursuant to the request of the First Committee, expressed at previous sessions, to do his utmost to revive the work of these centres by encouraging Member States interested in their work to make voluntary contributions for the activities of the centres and by finding alternative means for financing the work of the centres.

The other is as administrator of the Organization, in which capacity he has to act in a manner that is responsible in terms of the resources that are available to him. In that connection, he has, in the context of the proposed budget for the next biennium, brought to the attention of the Fifth Committee the problems that we have with financing the activities of the centres.

It was in fact a decision of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) to request the Secretary-General to submit this report to the First Committee at this session. We had some difficulty finding an appropriate item under which to submit the report. The request came about a week ago — rather late — and the Budget Office, which actually compiled the report, did its utmost to provide the report before the end of the First Committee session.

As I said, upon closer examination of the content of this report, delegations will see that the Secretary-General is drawing attention to both positive and negative aspects of the flow of voluntary contributions. As I indicated, the matter is not completely closed; it is still being discussed in the Fifth Committee. I believe that the way to proceed is for delegations in this Committee to advise their colleagues in the Fifth Committee to take appropriate positions.

But the facts in this report are undeniable. It took the Budget Office quite some time to collect them and to present a very accurate and very clear-cut picture in terms of the inflow of voluntary contributions. We would have preferred to have had more time to prepare the report and to have been able to submit it to the Committee sooner. But the mechanics of the budget are such that it was necessary to submit the report at this session and to proceed as requested by the ACABQ.

I hope that this clarifies some of the concerns raised by members of the Committee.

Mr. Al-Hassan (Oman): The comments of my delegation will be confined to the question of transparency, in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

Oman supports transparency in all forms relating to armament and military development. We support all the draft resolutions introduced on this subject in this Committee, as we have done in the past, and we will continue to do so. We believe that it is one of the most important elements in strengthening confidence among States.

My delegation would be remiss if it did not state its position with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 and A/C.1/52/L.43 and the Register of Conventional Arms. My delegation's position is quite consistent with that expressed by the Arab Group regarding

the inherent deficiencies that exist in the Register, particularly on the need for it to be more comprehensive and to include information on weapons of mass destruction as well as on conventional arms.

Given the calamities in the region, my delegation thinks that expanding the Register will be an important step that will serve the immediate security needs of many States in the region. I hope that in the future the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 will find its way into the draft resolution on transparency, now contained in document A/C.1/52/L.43.

The Chairman: I will now give the floor to those members of the Committee wishing to explain their positions or votes before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

Separate votes have been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 3.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mexico participates in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. However, from its inception we have maintained the need to expand it to include weapons of mass destruction so as to bolster its effectiveness as a means of building confidence through transparency.

We have some doubts about the scope of the terms used in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, but we support its overall sense of balance. We trust that in the coming year consultations will make it possible to refine the concepts being outlined here and that ultimately we shall be able to prepare a single resolution on the subject that will command general support.

My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 and all the paragraphs contained therein.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): The United States places the highest emphasis on the concept of transparency in armaments and was proud to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

This draft resolution endorses the consensus report of the Group of Governmental Experts, including its recommendations. Not all of the objectives of individual participants in the Group met with consensus. For example, the United States was disappointed that the Group failed to recommend the expansion of the Register to report data on military holdings and procurement through national production on the same basis as imports and exports. Nevertheless, draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 tries to reflect the consensus of the Group and aims at maximizing support for the Register.

Unfortunately, I cannot say the same for draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2, Egypt's draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments". This draft resolution focuses on transparency related to weapons of mass destruction and goes well beyond the Group's consensus on this difficult issue. I would recall that the Group failed to reach consensus on including possible new types and categories in the Register. This failure also applies to Egypt's proposal for a new category on stocks of weapons of mass destruction. Earlier, Egypt joined the consensus of the Group, including its observations on the issue of transparency as related to weapons of mass destruction. It is unfortunate that Egypt has now decided to try to walk back that consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2 directly links the concepts of transparency and conventional arms to transparency and weapons of mass destruction. No widespread agreement exists on how transparency could apply to weapons of mass destruction. Accordingly, linking it to transparency in conventional weapons, and to the Register, is a recipe for inaction and failure. We hope that is not its intention. The existence of weapons of mass destruction anywhere in the world could be used by any Member State as an excuse not to participate in the Register. We will never be able to build confidence if we allow such a transparent loophole to justify non-participation.

Moreover, draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2 is unnecessary since draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 already contains a provision to address the Egyptian concerns. Operative paragraph 7 invites the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work on transparency in armaments. It is high time to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee on this subject so that the concerns of States related to transparency can be discussed in a more substantive manner than in a debate on a draft resolution here in the First Committee.

For these reasons, my country opposes draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2 and urges others to do so as well.

Mr. Millim (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of

the European Union on the subject of transparency in the area of armaments, and in particular on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.2. The countries of Eastern and Central Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — associate themselves with this explanation of vote. Iceland and Norway, member countries of the European Economic Space, also align themselves with this statement.

The European Union took note with great satisfaction of the fact that the Group of Governmental Experts on the Register of Conventional Arms were able to achieve consensus in their report last August. Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, presented by the Netherlands, reflects that consensus, and its main purpose is to make the recommendations of the group of experts operational.

This is why the European Union has regretted that Egypt, which took part in the Group's consensus, submitted its own draft, which focuses on transparency in the context of weapons of mass destruction in a way which goes far beyond the Group's consensus on this sensitive and controversial issue.

Over the last four weeks, consultations and intensive negotiations have taken place with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 and the delegation of the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2, so as to take into account in the Netherlands draft the concerns expressed by the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2.

As far as the European Union is concerned, those consultations were always based on the premise that the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 would withdraw the draft and support draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 if its concerns were taken into consideration.

In the course of those consultations, language was found that took account of the specific concerns of the primary sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1. While that language caused considerable difficulties for some of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, they were nonetheless ready to accept it in order to secure the support of the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

The European Union was therefore surprised to learn that the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, while agreeing to withdraw that draft resolution, could still not support draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 even if it included the agreed amendments. This led to an unacceptable situation in which the specific concerns of one Member State would be reflected in a draft resolution that would then not be supported by that very same Member State.

At that point, of course, there was no real chance of achieving a credible compromise. The European Union opposes draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 not only because of the procedure followed, but also because after the Group's consensus in 1997, one Member State represented in the Group is now seeking to break that consensus. At the same time, draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 is not acceptable to the European Union for very important reasons of principle, for the draft resolution establishes a one-to-one relationship between the concept of transparency in conventional arms and that of transparency with regard to weapons of mass destruction. The Union is well aware that positions on the latter subject vary considerably. However, whatever the views with regard to ways of applying transparency to weapons of mass destruction, transparency cannot be linked either to transparency in the area of conventional arms or to the Register.

The success achieved in Europe and elsewhere in the sphere of confidence-building measures with regard to conventional arms would not have been possible had weapons of mass destruction been included in the equation. Nor would the Register have been strengthened had that notion been accepted, because Member States could use the very existence of weapons of mass destruction as a pretext for non-participation in the Register, thus undermining its validity.

In this light, the States members of the European Union and those States associating themselves with this explanation of vote once again appeal urgently to the primary sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 to withdraw that draft resolution. Should that draft resolution be put to the vote, those States will vote against it as a bloc.

Ms. Laker (Canada): As is widely known in the First Committee, Canada is a firm advocate of the contribution that greater transparency can make in the fields of arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament. However, we are concerned by some of the terminology employed in draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 and have uncertainties regarding its specific meaning. Thus, while reaffirming our commitment to transparency as a positive and vital element

of our work, Canada will vote "no" on this draft resolution.

Ms. Martinic (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Argentina fully agrees with the conclusion reached by the Group of Governmental Experts on the continuing operation and further development of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms to the effect that although the Register relates to conventional arms, the principle of transparency can also be applied, jointly with other measures, to weapons of mass destruction and the transfer of high technology with military applicability. This is recognized in paragraph 5 (a) of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, which the Committee adopted on Friday, 14 November. We do not therefore feel that another resolution need be adopted on the same subject.

Furthermore, my delegation believes that the development of transparency mechanisms in the sphere of weapons of mass destruction should not have the effect of weakening the effectiveness and efficiency of the existing mechanisms designed to create transparency in the area of conventional arms, such as the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

For this reason, and because we believe that any progress in this area should command consensus if it is to be successful, my delegation does not agree with the drafting of paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1. For those reasons, my delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Goosen (South Africa): It is South Africa's intention to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, on the basis of a clear policy on the part of our Government in favour of greater transparency in armaments. That policy applies to all armaments, whether conventional arms or weapons of mass destruction.

In the case of operative paragraph 3, on which, however, we will abstain, my Government has been a strong supporter of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, and we do not believe that a linkage should be established between this draft resolution, A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 and draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43.

Mr. Bakiet (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation believes that transparency in armaments contributes greatly to building confidence between States and to the achievement of peace. In that context, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43. In explaining our vote on that draft resolution, we indicated that transparency should be extended to weapons of mass destruction and to the transfers of equipment and technologies related to the development and manufacture of such weapons to strengthen peace and confidence among States throughout the world, to eliminate all weapons without selectivity and to ensure the transparency to which we all aspire. In view of these considerations, Sudan will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 and wishes to be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

Ms. Hamilton (Australia): I am speaking to explain Australia's intention to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1. Australia supports as a general proposition the application of transparency and other confidence-building measures in the field of weapons of mass destruction. However, in our view, by implying that transparency in the field of conventional weapons is conditional on enhancing transparency in the field of weapons of mass destruction, draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 reaches too far, and, as is now clear, the linkage is a divisive one.

We also regret that the sustained efforts by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 to reach a compromise have failed and that two draft resolutions on the subject of transparency in armaments have gone forward for the Committee's consideration.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on preambular paragraph 6 and operative paragraph 3.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 24th meeting of the Committee, on 17 November 1997. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution and those appearing in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, it was also sponsored by the Niger and the Sudan.

The Committee is now voting on the sixth preambular paragraph, which reads as follows:

"*Stressing* the need to achieve universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention as well as other instruments related to transfers of equipment and technologies directly related to the development and manufacture of such weapons, with a view to realizing the goal of the total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Georgia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Malta, Marshall Islands, Norway, Republic of Korea, San Marino, Senegal, Sweden, Turkey, Uzbekistan

The sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 was retained by 80 votes to 34, with 25 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Sri Lanka informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to continue the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Abstaining:

Argentina, Belarus, Chile, Cyprus, Georgia, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Solomon Islands, South Africa

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 was adopted by 73 votes to 46, with 17 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Sri Lanka informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to continue the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Abstaining:

Argentina, Belarus, Chile, China, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Pakistan, Republic of Korea

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 81 votes to 45, with 16 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Sri Lanka informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes or positions.

Mr. Fu Zhigang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): China supports the application of appropriate and workable measures for transparency in armaments.

China has participated annually in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and has always supported a total ban on, and complete destruction of, all weapons of mass destruction.

Furthermore, we believe that in order to achieve these objectives, the ultimate application of the principle of transparency to weapons of mass destruction is necessary and inevitable.

The international community has now concluded the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), and negotiations on a BWC protocol are proceeding smoothly. Problems related to transparency and verification with regard to these two categories of weapons of mass destruction have been resolved or are being addressed.

With regard to the other category of existing weapons of mass destruction — nuclear weapons — it is our view that the immediate priority should be to proceed from our current reality and that efforts should be made to promote the process of nuclear disarmament and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In this connection, the countries with the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenals should continue to take the

lead in reducing drastically those arsenals and in renouncing their double or multiple standards regarding the proliferation of nuclear weapons in order to create conditions for ultimate full transparency and the total destruction of nuclear weapons.

For these reasons, the Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", and we did not participate in the voting on the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 because it reflects useful elements for a broader approach to the question of transparency than has prevailed thus far.

Weapons of mass destruction cannot be excluded from the efforts of the international community in the area of transparency. To apply the principle of transparency to conventional weapons alone or to attempt to view transparency in conventional weapons as distinct from that in weapons of mass destruction would be to take a discriminatory and selective approach that we do not endorse.

We hope that the Committee will be able next year to adopt a single resolution on this issue that takes duly into account the need for transparency to be integral in all its aspects. In the meantime, I wish to place it clearly on record that my delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution can in no way be interpreted as representing a change in our position vis-à-vis the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. That is why my delegation abstained in the separate voting on the sixth preambular paragraph.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): My delegation voted against retaining the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1. While we support the treaties mentioned and their universality, this paragraph distorts their purposes and goals.

Mr. Manickam (India): My delegation called for a separate vote on and voted against the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 — which stresses, *inter alia*, the need to achieve universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) — and abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole. The reasons for this are obvious and consistent with India's stand on the NPT. India is not a party to the NPT and has no intention of becoming one.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I wish to note for the record that our vote against the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 should not be interpreted as indicating that we have any problem with the appeal to achieve universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention or the Biological Weapons Convention. We have consistently asserted that these very important international disarmament instruments should be universal and that all countries that have not yet done so should accede to them as soon as possible.

Our negative vote on the paragraph reflects the fact that the text is so drafted as to distort the purposes, content and basic orientation of these treaties. That is why we were compelled to press the red button.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", because we attach great importance to transparency in weapons of mass destruction, in all its aspects.

However, we are of the view that, in accordance with the content of resolution 46/36 L, adopted by the General Assembly in 1991, the principle of transparency in armaments applies to conventional weapons, high technology with military applications and weapons of mass destruction in all their aspects. As stated by the representative of Egypt, a sponsor of the draft resolution, our vote on this draft resolution should in no way be interpreted to indicate that we have changed our position on the necessity of transparency in high technology with military applications.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1. Separate votes have been requested on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1.

I shall now give the floor to those members of the Committee wishing to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. Manickam (India): My delegation has called for a recorded vote on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1.

Though it is entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons", it would perhaps have been more correctly entitled "Implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)", since the draft resolution appears to seek, as we pointed out last year, to introduce into a General Assembly resolution language adopted by the States parties to the Treaty. In previous years, when this draft resolution has been presented, we have voiced our objection to this intention. Since it has been repeated this year, we will have to maintain our position on the draft resolution even though we support the elimination of nuclear weapons, regardless of the forum in which it is negotiated.

We do not happen to believe — and the experience of the international community to date supports this view — that the NPT route will in fact lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, the indefinite extension of the Treaty appears to have only further served the interests of those States that do not want to move towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. We therefore cannot agree with the draft resolution, which seeks to translate the inequality of the NPT into customary law and which welcomes the indefinite extension of such a Treaty.

We have also called for a separate vote on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1. The ninth preambular paragraph welcomes the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). Our position on the adoption of this Treaty is known. The reasons for our position are still valid and do not need repetition. Our reasons for opposing operative paragraph 1 are evident. India has not signed the NPT and has no intention of doing so.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This year, my delegation will once again abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, because we believe that it does not establish a minimum basis for universal acceptance in the area of nuclear disarmament.

As we have indicated ever since this draft resolution began circulating in the Committee, it focuses, despite its title, on questions of non-proliferation and stresses a treaty that is essentially selective and discriminatory — the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons — and to which my country is not a State party. In my delegation's view, it does not help to create as speedily as possible the requisite conditions for moving towards the objective of nuclear disarmament.

We shall therefore abstain in the voting on operative paragraph 1 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will be voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1. Had the amendments contained in L.48 been put to the vote, we would also have voted in favour of those amendments.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1.

Separate votes have been requested on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons" was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 16th meeting, on 16 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, it was also co-sponsored by the following countries: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Niger, Portugal, Romania and South Africa.

The Committee will now vote on the ninth preambular paragraph, which reads as follows:

> "Welcoming the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty at the fiftieth session of the General Assembly and its opening for signature at the beginning of the fifty-first session, and noting the subsequent signing of that Treaty by over 140 Member States".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador,

Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania

The ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 was retained by 141 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on the Committee Secretary to continue the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Cuba

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 was retained by 142 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: I again call on the Committee Secretary to continue the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 138 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

The Chairman: I will now call on those delegations who wish to explain their position or vote after the decision.

Mr. Fu Zhigang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons" and sponsored by Japan, China voted in favour of both the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 and, for the first time, also voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

China has always stood for a total prohibition and complete destruction of nuclear weapons. Therefore we have no objection to the thrust and objective of this resolution, which is that nuclear weapons should ultimately be eliminated and, until then, their proliferation should be prevented.

We have noted that this year's draft is an improvement over those of the past two years. It is comprehensive and balanced, and this has created the conditions for our switch to a favourable vote on the resolution.

In recent years, some non-aligned countries have also sponsored resolutions on nuclear disarmament which have enjoyed the support of most of the countries. As both the draft by the Non-Aligned Movement and resolution L.28/Rev.1 are aimed at the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons, we once suggested and continue to hope that the sponsors of these two resolutions can enter into friendly consultations with a view to combining these two resolutions. We believe this could be a specific step to facilitate the rationalization of the work of the First Committee and to improve its efficiency.

Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh): Bangladesh voted yes on resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 and on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, because my delegation considers it a step towards the attainment of general and complete nuclear disarmament, which in our opinion should be the global community's primary concern, and in the pursuit of which we shall make every effort.

In no way does our support for this resolution and for the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 prejudice our basic position and our priorities as just enunciated. We would have liked to see a much stronger thrust in the direction of total nuclear disarmament than the language currently contains.

However, I must also add that we favour, as we always have and shall, all measures towards non-proliferation as well, which is what led us to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)

and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). It is this consistency that our positive votes reflect.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): The views of my delegation on the issue of nuclear disarmament are basically reflected in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.29, which was adopted by the First Committee last week.

My delegation also supports the basic thrust of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, sponsored by the Japanese delegation. However, we abstained in the voting on this draft resolution because its substance is not consistent with its title. The draft resolution purports to be a nuclear-disarmament initiative, but its elements focus solely on non-proliferation issues. Accordingly, my delegation believes that the draft resolution in its present form still needs some improvements if it is to be relevant to its title.

As regards the seventh preambular paragraph, while we welcome the decision on strengthening the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons review process and the decision on principles and objectives, we believe it is too early to welcome the decision to extend the Treaty indefinitely, since we are still waiting to see how the various decisions and resolutions adopted at the Review and Extension Conference will be implemented and whether commitments agreed upon after intensive negotiations will indeed be fulfilled in good faith.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): For the following reasons my delegation was unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, which was just put to the vote.

First, in our view, the text duplicates and, indeed, in some respects conflicts with draft resolution, A/C.1/52/L.29, which, as in the case of similar draft resolutions in the past, Algeria supported by co-sponsoring. Secondly, the title given to the draft does not seem to us to reflect exactly the content of the document. Thirdly, some of the elements included are not in accord with our views on nuclear disarmament. These views are in complete harmony with the position appropriately reaffirmed by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) at the Cartagena Summit, at the New Delhi Conference in April 1997 and at its meeting in New York on 25 September, in the context of the fifty-second session of the General Assembly, through its promotion of concrete steps to eliminate nuclear weapons. Fourthly, the conceptual approach of this draft resolution — that is, non-proliferation — does not include specific measures for, or give priority to, achieving the total and definitive elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified time-frame.

Lastly, if the amendments submitted by Pakistan in document A/C.1/52/L.48 had been put to the vote, my delegation would have voted in favour of those amendments.

For all of these reasons, my delegation was unable to vote in favour of this draft resolution, and we once again appeal to its authors to strive during the next session to take into account the concerns of a large number of countries, including my own.

Mrs. Laose-Ajayi (Nigeria): The views of the Nigerian delegation on this item have been very well reflected in the draft resolution we adopted, contained in document A/C.1/52/L.29. We feel it has addressed all the pertinent concerns.

The Nigerian delegation was unable to vote in favour of the present draft resolution because we believe it has not addressed the issues substantively enough. It is our hope that next year we will be able to merge the two draft resolutions, so that we can have one draft on this very important issue.

The Chairman: If no other delegations wish to take the floor at this stage, the Committee will now proceed to consider the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/52/L.51/Rev.1.

I had tabled the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/52/L.51/Rev.1 on the understanding that it would command consensus. I now understand that amendments to the draft decision are being proposed. Since I have no intention of holding another meeting of the Committee tomorrow, I have decided to withdraw the draft decision for further consultations by the Chairman. The Chairman or his successor will report the results of these consultations to the Committee at its next session.

Concluding statement by the Chairman

We have concluded the last phase of the Committee's work: action on all draft resolutions and decisions under agenda items 62 to 83. As we approach the end of our work, I would like to share with members some reflections on the work of the First Committee as we come to the conclusion of the fifty-second session.

At the outset, let me commend all delegations for the cooperative atmosphere that has permeated our deliberations in the past few weeks. There was an overall mood of mutual respect, even where national positions might have suggested differently. That mood definitely enhanced the image of the United Nations as an institution devoted to dialogue, even on matters related to sovereign interests and national security. This reinforced the sense that the Governments represented here are engaged in a collaborative joint effort aimed at confidence-building and, therefore, fostering disarmament. I wish to express my appreciation to all delegations for contributing to this positive atmosphere.

At this juncture, let me highlight some issues that appear to have been notable in the deliberations of the First Committee during this session.

It is noteworthy that efforts have indisputably been made in scaling down nuclear weapons at both the unilateral and bilateral levels. It is equally indisputable that the world expects the process to continue at a steady and more rapid pace and that this should be done at the multilateral level.

It is my ardent hope that a solution will soon be found on those issues which divide us, and I especially hope that some progress will be made in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament at its session next year.

On a different note, I must say I am encouraged by the progress being made in the area of nuclear non-proliferation at the regional level, particularly with respect to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The existing nuclear-weapon-free zones are being strengthened. The Committee has requested the Disarmament Commission to continue its work on setting out guidelines for the establishment of such zones. The five zonal States of Central Asia understand the complexities involved in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in their region, and they have requested the assistance of the international community in the realization of such a zone. They are determined to achieve their objective, and they need the cooperation and understanding of their neighbours, some of which are nuclear-weapon States. I am pleased that the First Committee has given them encouragement in their endeavour.

The First Committee has also had two first-time events this session in the area of weapons of mass destruction. We heard an outstanding statement by the newly appointed Director-General of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, which was established in The Hague in April this year. The Committee welcomed the entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the inauguration of the Organization. We were informed of the recent ratification of the Convention by several important States, particularly the declared chemical-weapon States. Those ratifications have increased confidence in the Convention and the chemical disarmament regime and bode well for the future universalization of the agreement.

We also heard, for the first time, a report by the Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, who was appointed last March and started the substantive work of the Provisional Technical Secretariat without delay.

These two events are significant for two reasons. They highlight the important links between the First Committee of the General Assembly and those organizations; and they also point the way to further collaboration in consolidating and strengthening existing disarmament and arms-limitation agreements.

Regarding conventional weapons, the Committee heard an impassioned exchange of views on the issue of anti-personnel mines. Of all the items we have dealt with this session, this was the one issue which received the greatest scrutiny from international public opinion; expectations had grown sharply for the United Nations disarmament machinery to play its part in this worldwide effort.

In my view, our deliberations confirmed once again that all States share the basic humanitarian objective of eliminating anti-personnel mines, which maim and kill indiscriminately even in post-conflict situations. The final objective of the universalization of this new norm in international disarmament law seems to be accepted and underlined. Nonetheless, it was also clear that not all States are ready to accept at this time a total ban on those weapons or to sign the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction.

I am most grateful to all members that the debate on this issue did not degenerate into what could have become a war between "humanitarian virtucrats" and "mine mongers". However, views continue to differ on the mechanism to be employed to eliminate the menace presented by mines. Some prefer the universalization of the Ottawa process and some the strict compliance with and greater adherence to Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCWC) and

its review process, while others prefer the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. In the interests of the numerous victims of these weapons, I should like to seize this opportunity to express the hope that States will continue to promote the achievement of the final goal of eliminating these mines altogether through ways and means acceptable to all parties concerned.

As to other conventional weapons, there is broad agreement in the First Committee that the international community should continue to tackle the widespread problem of the illegal and illicit proliferation of small arms. The General Assembly had before it the report on small arms, an unprecedented effort at the international level to grasp the scope of the issue and to make recommendations on what contribution it could make to its resolution. Coming from a part of the world that has experienced some of the worst consequences of these flows of weapons, I welcome the fact that the Committee will continue to be seized of the matter. The two studies foreseen in draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1 — a study of the problems of ammunition and explosives and a report on the implementation of the recommendations of the report on small arms — should shed greater light on how the United Nations should tackle this issue.

The First Committee has once again recognized the important contribution that transparency and openness in armaments can make to confidence-building and trust among States, thereby fostering the adoption of mutually agreed disarmament measures. It has welcomed the report of the Group of Governmental Experts that reviewed the continuing operation and further development of the Register of Conventional Arms and called for fuller participation and greater openness by all States. Notwithstanding the continued divergence of views on how to expand the scope of the Register as a transparency measure, I should like to stress that the Register is already proving its viability as a confidence-building measure that contributes in no small measure to international security.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the Committee has this year been able to adopt without a vote the resolution on convening the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I welcome this meeting of the minds in the Committee and hope the Disarmament Commission will yield positive results in its consideration of this issue next year.

The Committee's meetings this year have been held during the session at which the General Assembly is considering the Secretary-General's proposals for renewing the United Nations. The General Assembly has just approved the proposal of the Secretary-General to reinstate the Department for Disarmament Affairs. Let me, on behalf of all members of the Committee, welcome that decision. It is my view that the reinstatement of the Department for Disarmament Affairs constitutes a clear signal to all nations that the Assembly recognizes the contribution that the determined pursuit of effective and verifiable disarmament can make to reinforcing a culture of cooperation in the field of international peace and security.

The First Committee has once again taken up the issue of the rationalization of its work and reform of its agenda. The Committee demonstrated flexibility in reviewing its procedures and discarded those which seemed no longer to work. Here I must express regret that we were not able to adopt the decision that we had hoped to adopt at the end of our work today.

On a personal note, as Chairman of the Committee, I should like to thank all members of the Committee most sincerely for the cooperation they have extended to me during this session. It was indeed a singular honour and privilege for me to have worked with people so distinguished and knowledgeable in the field of disarmament. Members have reinvigorated and sharpened my tools of analysis in the area, and I wish to thank them for the free education. It is most heartening to preside over a Committee in which one feels one is among friends.

I also wish to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to the two Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Sudjadnan Parnohadiningrat and Mr. Alejandro Verdier, and to the Rapporteur, Mr. Miloš Koterec, for their assistance and camaraderie.

Let me, on behalf of the Committee, thank the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Prvoslav Davinic, as well as the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung and all his collaborators in the Secretariat, for their professionalism and efficiency, without which the work of the Committee could not have run so smoothly.

Last, but by no means least, I wish to extend a special word of thanks to our interpreters, translators, record keepers, press officers, conference and documents officers, sound engineers and all those who worked behind the scenes to make the work of the Committee run smoothly.

I call on the representative of Colombia.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I just wanted to express briefly, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, our gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, and our congratulations on the exemplary fashion in which you have guided our deliberations, which has enabled the work of the First Committee to show positive results. The countries of the Non-Aligned Movement also wish to thank the other members of the Bureau for their work.

I would also like to express our gratitude to the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, the members of the Secretariat, the conference officers and the interpreters for their impeccable work in support of the work of the Committee.

The Chairman: I now give the floor to the representative of Luxembourg.

Mr. Millim (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the European Union and associated states and members of the European Economic Area, which align themselves with this statement, I would like to convey to you, Mr. Chairman, my sincere congratulations.

Throughout our meetings, the European Union has endeavoured to give you its fullest possible support as you fulfilled your lofty responsibilities. Generally speaking, this session was not one of the most difficult, even though we had to take certain difficult decisions by voting on them.

On behalf of the European Union, I would like to offer you our sincere thanks for the excellent job you have done and for those times when you lent us your support. I personally appreciated greatly your sense of humour and the discipline that you were able to impose on members, which enabled us to begin and end our daily work on time and allowed us to begin each day fresh and full of energy.

Of course, we also wish to thank the other members of the Bureau and all those who supported you so effectively in carrying out your responsibilities, particularly the Secretary of the Committee, whose long experience has worked wonders once again this year. Our deep appreciation also goes to the interpreters and the persons responsible for producing and distributing documents. Without their effective and ubiquitous support for delegations, we would not have been able to complete our session. Therefore, thank them all very much.

Finally, I would like to say how much we have appreciated working with all our colleagues present here in the room, in particular with those with whom we have been engaged in direct negotiations throughout our meetings. We thank them. The European Union intends to continue these discussions next year in the same spirit of mutual cooperation.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Kenya.

Ms. Tolle (Kenya): The Group of African States fully associates itself with the statement just made by the representative of Colombia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, to which we belong; and on behalf of the Group of African States, I wish to express our appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and our congratulations on the successful manner in which you have conducted the work of the First Committee this year. Your pragmatic approach and diplomatic skills and experience have enabled this Committee to conclude its work well ahead of schedule. Your personal qualities and pleasant sense of humour have been refreshing, and, on a personal note, I congratulate you on being such a good student.

Our thanks also go to the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur for the supportive role they have played. Our gratitude is also extended to Mr. Davinic, Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, and Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, Secretary of the Committee, for the assistance they have extended to us all. I would be remiss if I failed to recognize the presence of Mr. Petrovsky and Mr. Bensmail, Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General of the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament, respectively, whose wide experience in the subject matter, as in previous years, has enhanced our work. We also wish to thank all conference officers, interpreters, translators and all the others who contributed to our work.

In the last seven weeks, we have greatly appreciated the spirit of cooperation, consultation and compromise demonstrated by all delegations. Friendships have been built and partnerships found. In this respect, we convey our appreciation to the various regional coordinators, as well as individual delegations and delegates, for being accommodating and understanding.

As this session advances, the prospects for the new year and the forthcoming holiday season draw near. I wish, on behalf of the Group of African States, to convey to each and every member of the Committee our warm seasonal greetings and best wishes for 1998, and to those who are travelling back to their respective duty stations, I wish to say *bon voyage*.

The Chairman: I now give the floor to the representative of Uzbekistan.

Mr. Vohidov (Uzbekistan): In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Asian States for the month of November, I should like, on behalf of the delegations of the Asian States, to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your excellent leadership, which has helped us bring the deliberations and work of the First Committee to a successful and early conclusion. Your wide knowledge and diplomatic experience played a very important role in helping us to reach this result.

I should also like to extend our gratitude to the Bureau and all members of the Secretariat for their contribution to the work of the Committee, as well as to the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Davinic, and the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, for their very professional work and for the help they have extended to all of us. Many thanks also go to the interpreters, the conference officers and, indeed, to everyone who has facilitated the smooth work of the First Committee.

On behalf of the delegations of our Group, Mr. Chairman, I wish you all the best in your future undertakings.

The Chairman: I now give the floor to the representative of Belarus.

Mr. Laptsenak (Belarus) (*interpretation from Russian*): It is my honour and pleasure, on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and all the members of the Bureau, on the successful completion of the work of the First Committee.

The traditional abundance of draft resolutions and decisions adopted by the First Committee, their content and their thrust called for many consultations and agreements and a demonstration by sponsors and participants in debates, of a spirit of compromise and realism. In the final analysis, the basic trends characterizing the efforts of the international community in the area of the maintenance of international security and disarmament have been adequately reflected and further consolidated. On each issue addressed, the resolutions and decisions adopted demonstrate appropriate and real ways and means to make further progress towards general and complete disarmament. In many instances, they reflected those steps and important decisions that have already been implemented by Member States, both in the field of conventional armaments and in that of weapons of mass destruction. Some are already producing practical results in the near term, and the consequences of others will be seen only after some time. However, in both instances, the recurrent theme is the need for coordinated and systematic cooperation among all members of the international community, without which it will be impossible to resolve outstanding issues.

The persistence and tolerance that, on the whole, characterized the present session and the discussions of the First Committee is no doubt to the credit of the participants and of your leadership, Sir. Your diplomatic skills and mastery were a reliable indicator of the discussions of this session. We are doubly delighted to congratulate you on your highly professional approach to the stewardship of this Committee in taking the baton from the chairmanship of Belarus. We would also like to congratulate and thank all those who have supported us in our efforts.

With the discussions in the First Committee having reached their conclusion, the members of the Group of Eastern European States, together with our partners from other regions, are prepared to initiate joint work aimed at implementing the decisions taken.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Antigua and Barbuda.

Mr. Hunte (Antigua and Barbuda): In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States for the month of November and on behalf of the delegations of the Group, I wish, Sir, to express our gratitude for the way in which you guided the deliberations of the Committee to a successful and early conclusion. Through you, I should like also to express our gratitude to the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Davinic; the Secretary, Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung; the Rapporteur; and the two Vice-Chairmen.

Let me not forget the Secretariat, whose arduous work helped to ensure the successful conclusion of the work of the Committee. May I also express thanks to the conference officers, the interpreters and all the administrative staff who have contributed to the successful conclusion of this session.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Jamaica.

Mr. McCook (Jamaica): I want to associate myself and our delegations — the delegations of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) States Members of the United Nations — with the statements of Colombia, on behalf of

the Non-Aligned Movement, and of the Chairman of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, on behalf of the States of that Group. We want to join in thanking you, Sir, and the Bureau for the exemplary manner in which you have conducted the work of this Committee. Our thanks also go, through you, to Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, Secretary of the Committee; Mr. Davinic, Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs; Cheryl Stoute, Secretary of the Disarmament Commission; and all the members of the Secretariat who have given full support to our efforts and have contributed in no small way to the success and early conclusion of our work.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Malta.

Ms. Darmanin (Malta): On behalf of the Group of Western European and other States, allow me to thank you, Sir, for the skilful and efficient manner in which you presided over the work of this Committee. Your patience, perseverance and, I might add, good humour served us well in the successful outcome of our work. Our thanks and appreciation also go to the Bureau of the Committee, the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs and the Secretary of the Committee, as well as all the Secretariat, whose hard work also facilitated the smooth functioning of our work.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.